

**A collection of some news, excerpts of
letters, texts and communiques from the
armed group 'Revolutionary Struggle'
in Greece**



2014 -15 -16



Responsibility claim by the organization Revolutionary Struggle [25.4.2014]

excerpts

On the 10th of April 2014, Revolutionary Struggle carried out a bombing attack against the Supervision Directorate of the Bank of Greece at Amerikis Street [Athens], a building which also houses the IMF's resident representative in Greece, Wes McGrew. Although the blow targeted the Bank of Greece, the head office of Piraeus Bank which is located exactly on the opposite side of the street also suffered damage, what makes the hit even more successful, because the Piraeus Bank has evolved in one of the largest systemic Greek banking institutions after the acquisition of ATEbank, it has benefited from the predatory memorandum-policy applied against the Greek people in recent years, and is one of the financial factors that are jointly responsible for people's woes.

The attack was carried out with a car bomb containing 75kg of ANFO explosive. Exactly four years after the crackdown against the organization, and while the State alongside many enemies of armed struggle were cheering for the "success of dismantling" the Revolutionary Struggle, this action came to prove them wrong. The bombing against the Bank of Greece is dedicated to anarchist comrade Lambros Foundas, a member of the Revolutionary Struggle who was killed in an armed clash with police officers in Dafni on March 10th, 2010, during a preparatory action of the organization. The comrade lost his life during an attempt to expropriate a car which would be used in an action of the Revolutionary Struggle, in the context of the organization's strategy of that period—a period which marked the beginning of the economic crisis. This strategy was intended to strike and sabotage structures, institutions and persons that hold a central role in the largest, historically, antipopular assault that was to take place with the signing of the first memorandum in May 2010. Lambros Foundas fought and gave his life so that the contemporary junta of economic and political elites would not pass—the junta of the IMF/ECB/EU troika. He fought and gave his life so that the contemporary junta of the Capital and the State would not pass. So that the new totalitarianism imposed all over the planet, on the pretext of the global financial crisis, would not pass. Lambros Foundas gave his life fighting to turn the crisis into an opportunity for social Revolution. The Bank of Greece bombing is to some extent a continuation of that strategy which included the attacks against Citibank, Eurobank and the Athens stock exchange.

Thus, in honor of our comrade, the action against the Bank of Greece bears the signature Commando Lambros Foundas. Besides, the best homage to a comrade who gave his life in struggle is to continue the

struggle itself, for which he fell in combat. And this struggle has never had, or will ever have, any other direction but the overthrow of capitalism and the State —social Revolution.

A blow in response to Greece's return to the markets

As everyone figured out—from the government, the parties, to the Greek and international media—we chose the 10th of April for our attack because this date marks the exit of the Greek State to international financial markets in search of the first long-term loan after four years; the next day, April 11th, the leader of the most powerful European State, protagonist in the enforcement of extreme neoliberal policies and austerity across Europe, and one of the most ideal exponents of the interests of European economic elites, the archi-terrorist German chancellor, Angela Merkel, was scheduled to arrive in Greece for the political and economic capitalization of this “Greek success”. (...)

The “salvation of the country” concerns the big capital, the transnational ruling class and the powerful lenders of the country. It concerns the structures and institutions of globalized capitalism. It is linked to the States, the political staff in Greece and Europe; to all sorts of political lackeys of the establishment, who support this regime at any price. It concerns a disgraceful minority of the Greek society.

Those whom this “salvation” does not concern—and instead they have paid and still pay with their own blood to save the system from the crisis—are the vast majority of people. The 5 million people who are living in conditions of poverty. The 2.5 million people who are living in absolute destitution. The 700,000 poor children who do not even have the basics, who are undernourished, who feel cold, suffer from fainting spells, and end up in institutions for a plate of food. Those who get sick, those who go mad. The ones who lose their home over debts to the banks and the State, those who live without electricity, those who lack the basic survival necessities. The 4,000 people who committed suicide because they were financially ruined. The thousands of homeless people, the ones who are depended on soup kitchens, who are digging through garbage to feed themselves, those who are slowly dying on the sidelines. All of these wretched that went financially and socially bankrupt, and pay the “salvation of the country” with their lives and the lives of their children. All these people have come to understand what it means to see your life go bankrupt, what it means to see your life not worth anything anymore. They have come to understand that the “avoidance of Greece's bankruptcy” means war against society, social euthanasia. (...)

Social revolution cannot be postponed to an indefinite future, nor be limited to an indistinct projectuality. It requires constant revolutionary action in the present time, and involves the organization and formation of a ground-breaking revolutionary movement that will elaborate and define its strategic steps, and clash with the establishment's centralized policies. It involves the political process and willingness to put specific revolutionary proposals into practice.

In the present circumstances, a revolutionary platform could be summarized as follows:

- Unilateral termination of payment of the Greek debt.
- Exit from the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) and the European Union (EU).
- Expropriation of assets of the Capital, large companies, multinational corporations, of all movable and immovable property of the capitalists.
- Abolition of the banking system, erasure of all debts to banks, handover of small possessions that were seized by banks, and socialization of bank assets.
- Expropriation of state property and utilities companies; expropriation of church property.
- Socialization of the means of production, industry, ports, means of transfer and communication, transportation, utilities, hospitals and educational institutions; the workers will engage in their managing.

-Abolition of the State and the bourgeois parliament of professional politicians, to be replaced by a confederal system of popular assemblies and workers' councils, whose coordination, communication and decision-implementation will be achieved through delegates elected and immediately recallable. At national level, in place of the old representative bourgeois parliament there will be a supreme Confederal People's Assembly, whose members will be authorized members-delegates elected and immediately recallable by the local popular assemblies and workers' councils.

-Abolition of the police and the army, to be replaced by an armed popular militia, not a mercenary one.

A discussion and agreement upon a revolutionary platform is a prerequisite for the creation of a revolutionary anticapitalist movement, and as Revolutionary Struggle we wish to see a well-intentioned dialogue opening on this issue. It is necessary that a Revolution overcomes national borders. It is unrealistic to believe that a Revolution will be viable if confined within the national borders of a small country like Greece. However let us make a beginning here, in Greece, for the demolition of the eurozone and the European Union, for the abolition of capitalism and the State. Let us put the armed proletarian counterattack into practice. Let us make a beginning here, in Greece, for an international social Revolution.

LONG LIVE SOCIAL REVOLUTION
FOR LIBERTARIAN COMMUNISM – FOR ANARCHY
FREEDOM TO POLITICAL PRISONERS
Commando Lambros Foundas
REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE



Presentation of Nikos Maziotis:
“Armed Struggle, Revolutionary Movement, and Social Revolution”
Athens Polytechnic, November 2014

[The talk began with various brief greetings to comrades attending the presentation, those of the squat KVOX for organizing the event, a reference by Maziotis to the government preventing him from speaking by phone to a prior meeting, etc. After this presentation, there were also some questions and responses which are not yet translated]...

This presentation deals with the theme, *“Armed Struggle, Revolutionary Movement and Social Revolution”* and has as its goal to show the clear and undeniable connection of armed struggle with the creation of a revolutionary movement that is a necessary precondition for social revolution, for the overturn of State and Capital.

I also believe that such a discussion is a good opportunity to begin political work that will aim at the creation of a certain form of political structure, that is to say a revolutionary movement that will try to overturn the rule of state and capital in the present-day Greek territory. Our goal as Revolutionary Struggle is the creation of such a revolutionary movement, and we have pursued this with our acts and our words. I believe with these words and acts we have brought political armaments and analysis into the anti-authoritarian space which can be used to build the base of a revolutionary movement. I would underline that a similar presentation in Thessaloniki at *Terra Incognita* squat at which I spoke, also fueled conversations and efforts to begin political work to form a revolutionary movement.

Moving on to today’s theme, I would like to begin by saying a bit about the character of Revolutionary Struggle concerning how we see armed struggle, what are its characteristics and what are its relations with the movement and with revolution. Revolutionary Struggle is an organization of armed propaganda. As its name implies, it is a group that tries in word and deed to spread to the larger society the idea of the need for social revolution, the abolition of state and capital, and the organization of the society on anarcho-communist bases to found a classless and stateless society. Our goal as an organization is both this revolution and the growth of action that will have this revolution as its orientation and goal.

Here, I will make one thing clear: a few armed members of revolutionary groups do not make revolutions, rather the people in arms following the direction of an organized revolutionary movement do so. The role of armed propaganda organizations is to send powerful political messages with their targeted actions. And these political messages have no other goal than to awaken the people to fight against and sabotage the political practices of the present system of domination, to show that this system is not invulnerable, that it can be overturned if people are conscious, awoken, organized, and if they attack those who exploit and repress them. That is to say, capital and the international elite, as we have characterized them in our analysis of today’s world of globalization, and also the state that acts as the guarantor for this elite and also is on its own a bureaucratic machine of oppression.

As an organization, I believe we have correctly analysed the world we live in, the existing political and economic conditions, right from the moment that we began our actions- that is to say in the beginning of the prior decade of the 2000s- and I think our actions were well-targeted and correct. Here I would like to say something about the conditions in which we began. At the start of the 2000s,

globalization was in full swing. The dictatorship of the markets progressed, the system believed itself all-powerful, and it took on more and more totalitarian characteristics, precisely to advance this dictatorship of the markets. From the “war on terrorism” to the neoliberal reforms that were advanced, the result showed the political-military and economic characteristics of globalization. And in Greece we had a parallel development. The country was put into the eurozone, the economy was controlled by multinational capital, neoliberal reforms were promoted and there was participation in the war against “terrorism” with the support of the Afghanistan and Iraq wars, the passing of “anti-terrorist” laws, and agreements of anti-terrorist cooperation between Greece, the EU and USA. In the same period we had the arrests of November 17 and ELA. With those arrests, the Greek government not only announced the end of armed struggle in Greece, but also the omnipotence of the system, claiming that any effort of overturn and revolution was in vain. Hence we began our actions in 2003, showing up the governmental lie that armed struggle was over, contradicting the governmental claims that it was omnipotent, in order to show that armed struggle continued in Greece and that the idea of overturn and revolution remained alive. In these conditions of the first period of our action from 2003 to 2007, the aim of our actions was the war against terrorism and the neoliberal reforms of the then-government of Karamanlis. The attacks on the Evelpidon courthouse, on police buildings and units, the Economics ministry and the minister of public order Boulgaraki, with the high point of the attack against the US embassy in Athens, to close with the attack on the police station in Perissos, all these attacks were a part of this strategy.

In opposition to the systematic propaganda about a “strong Greece” and the strong Greek economic growth in the eurozone, we said that Greece had a vast debt- from 2005 we said this- that the strong economy was a myth, and that in the event of an economic crisis breaking out the country would find itself in a very difficult situation, something that has been verified in a few years by the global economic crisis.

In the second period of our action from 2009 to the recent attack on the Bank of Greece in April 2014, the theme of our actions has been the systemic crisis. The political campaign was shaped on this basis, with the various attacks on Citibank, Eurobank, the Athens Stock Market, and the attack on the Bank of Greece, as part of our strategy to attack the structures of domestic and multinational capital, institutions and persons that are responsible for the crisis and for their attempts to save this political system.

Naturally our choice to act as an organization of armed propaganda does not mean that other forms of actions are useless. What it does mean is that a polymorphic revolutionary movement has to involve armed struggle. As we have said, there is a clear relation between a revolutionary movement and armed struggle, as a movement has to involve armed struggle in its goals if it wants to be practically revolutionary. Because historical experience has shown us that there is no revolution if it is not armed, and to overturn authority it is necessary to have recourse to arms. Some of these historical examples include: The Paris Commune of 1871, the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917, the German Revolution of 1918-19, the Spanish Revolution of 1936-7, the Greek resistance, the Chinese, Hungarian, Cuban revolutions, etc.

I will underline that struggles and movements that were not anti-capitalist, for example the Resistance movements in the countries under German occupation, used armed struggle and guerrilla tactics, like EAM in Greece. The same goes for the anti-imperialist and anti-colonial revolts in Third World countries, like for example Algeria or Vietnam. For us as Revolutionary Struggle, having as our goal social revolution, we believe that the basis of our actions is the massification of armed struggle, communication with widening sections of the lower social groups, and advancing a discourse that includes the perspective of a revolutionary movement, this perspective which above all we consider the primary thing needed for this same revolution.

A revolutionary movement will have its role as a political vanguard with the goal of providing people with ideas, suggestions, a political program, strategic actions; having as its literal aim to arm the poor, the people, workers- for the overturn of state and capital, for the realization of social revolution.

I will clarify what I mean by the word “vanguard”, since the word inspires a negative reaction. This vanguard is the same as the revolutionary movement. It is the most politically conscious section of the society which is responsible for leading and making a revolution. Historical experience has shown that in all revolutions there have been political forces that have taken this vanguard role in determination and direction. For instance in the Paris Commune it was the Blanquists that defined the political moment,

although of course Proudhonist anarchists were included. In the Russian revolution of 1917, the Bolsheviks triumphed over the other political forces, the social-revolutionaries and anarchists, and took over the control and direction of the revolution, something that defined the history of the 20th century until the collapse of the Eastern Bloc in 1989-91. In the German Revolution the political lead was taken by the Spartacists, in Spain it was the Anarchists in the CNT-FAI, in the Chinese or Greek experiences the corresponding communist parties. The Cuban revolution was led by the guerrilla group of Castro, Guevara, and Cienfuegos.

Hence, without the organization of a vanguard revolutionary movement, we cannot seriously speak of a perspective of overturn. As Revolutionary Struggle, ever since our political campaign back in 2009, with its attacks on CitiBank, Eurobank, the Stock Market, even from the first announcement of this period when we took responsibility for attacking the MAT at the Cultural Ministry in response for the killing of Grigoropoulos, we have talked about the need to create a revolutionary movement that will exploit the situations offered by the crisis.

We believed, and this has been confirmed, that there exist excellent chances- objective conditions, as we say- for the overturn of the system, if of course there exists a subjective factor, meaning an organized revolutionary movement that will have the desire to exploit these favorable conditions, to acquire from its actions popular social support, to create a wide social and class grouping to attempt an uprising. Whether favorable or otherwise, the objective conditions consist of the deregulation of the political and economic system due to the unprecedented attack of capital, the multinational elite and the State against the majority of the populace (which was inaugurated by the signing of the memorandum in 2010 and the subordination of the country to the authority of the Troika, the IMF, EU, and ECB).

The regime has lost the societal consent of the pre-crisis years. That is to say, there could not exist more positive chances than those now existing for a revolutionary attempt in the country. In the two following years of 2010-2012, there were the largest and most massive popular demonstrations against the anti-societal measures of the memorandum, where as everyone knows thousands were involved in confrontations with the forces of repression. These took place in Syntagma square, where thousands of people tried to storm the Parliament, the symbol *par excellence* of the delegitimised social system, the despised democracy of the bosses, where the obedient politicians of the multinational elite voted the hated anti-societal measures that were dictated by the memorandum agreements. In those two years, the system succeeded in narrowly avoiding its collapse in an unplanned exit from the eurozone and the euro, from an uncontrolled bankruptcy, something which would call forth even larger social reactions, chaos, ungovernability and possibly a brief absence of authority, which in our opinion if a revolutionary movement existed, it would seize this opportunity and not let anyone else do so.

The Papandreou government collapsed in the fall of 2011, and we said when we were arrested and took the responsibility for our “Political Letter to Society”, that the Papandreou government would not last because of its political decisions. Obviously, this government collapsed in these two years, not being able to support the weight of the memorandum measures, and gave way to a corporation-type government with a non-political figure at its head, the former #2 of the ECB, Lucas Papademas.

In the same time period there was the creation of the “indignados” movement that created popular assemblies in each neighborhood and many self-managed enterprises, but it did not subvert the attack of state and capital, nor stop the memorandum in the least. In my opinion this large opportunity was not exploited because there was missing the factor of a revolutionary movement, which could take advantage of these situations of systematic crisis and together with the people attempt subversion and an uprising.

The prior time I was in jail for the Revolutionary Struggle case, I spoke by phone in February 2011 with comrades from the “assembly in solidarity with arrested and wanted comrades” in Herakleio, Crete. I said that a great chance was opening up for the anarchist/anti-authoritarian space to organize as a movement, to make an intervention in the crisis and to push for overthrow and revolution. The anarchist/anti-authoritarian space, in the main, was not equal to the role it needed to play in these conditions. As then, and as of now, we cannot really say that there exists a movement, and we cannot confuse what exists today in the anarchist/anti-authoritarian space with what a movement means.

We cannot speak of a movement when there is a general situation of fragmentation and discord, or if we go further, a polarization between the existing collectives and the unorganized individuals that are the overwhelming majority of the space. We cannot speak of a movement when more disagree than agree, all in the name of a contorted understanding of differentiation and autonomy; when actions of various collectives, groups and individuals never converge; when we disdain the very concept or idea of politics, organization, unification, and accountability.

A movement is a united political formation, in federated form following anarchist models, with a unified political program, with at least a minimum of political agreement between those who make up the movement, and on this basis we offer the people and society the bypassing of state and capital towards the construction of a classless, stateless society. And as we theorize that a revolutionary movement has to have in its goals armed struggle, when we speak of this movement we mean a unified political-military form. And here I want to bring an example from the past, from the libertarian movement of Spain, the CNT-FAI, which of course belongs to other conditions than those of today. The FAI was founded as a clandestine organization in 1927 in the period of the Primo de Rivero dictatorship. It was created by members of combat organizations from the preceding years who had gun-battles with the pistoleros of the employers that were killing anarcho-syndicalist workers.

As to what is a movement, what are its suggestions and structures- it is a microcosm of the larger society it tries to make. For example, the monolithic and centralized party of the Bolsheviks resulted in the monolithic and totalitarian character of the regime of “real socialism”, while the federated structure of the anarchists reflects the federated character of stateless and classless society. We as Revolutionary Struggle, in so much as we are a structure of armed anarchist propaganda, function without hierarchy and the method of resolving decisions is the assembly of the members of the group- we are a microcosm of the new society we propose.

From our side, since 2009 we have talked of the need to create a revolutionary movement, we have been trying to bring together a political program, based on political positions and demands that a movement must have to measure up to the practical demands of the Greek situation. And we theorize that the growth of a political program, positions and proposals is necessary and involves a discussion on the organized forms of a movement. In that frame, with the responsibility claim for the recent attack of Revolutionary Struggle on the Bank of Greece in April 2014, we published our platform of positions and proposals that in our view a movement today must have, in this way wanting to establish a political dialogue in the midst of the anarchist/anti-authoritarian space.

In closing, I would like to say the following: besides the fact that since 2012 we have had a lessening of social resistance, where the popular mobilizations of that period have exhausted their potential and strength, and that in the elections of summer of 2012 the system maintained a fragile stability and the attack of the Samaras government from the elections onward continued the policy of the multinational elite with undiminished brutality, and that many people and some anarchists are stuck in the dead-end logic of playing the game of parliamentary politics in voting for Syriza- in spite of all this, *absolutely nothing is finished*. The war continues. The capitalist machine, not only in Greece but in Europe and globally, will continue to break down.

The system cannot reproduce itself. In Europe (not only in the South) recession is even hitting advanced economies like France, while Germany, the dynamo of European growth, will not remain unaffected. Contrary to the propaganda of the Greek government that the memorandum and crisis have ended and that the country will remove itself from the oversight of the troika, new measures, memorandums and austerity will become a continuous and enduring condition. The lowering of

incomes, reductions in wages and pensions, and the lowering of the costs of labour will become the general state of things, the same as heavy taxation.

The Greek economy will continue to be stuck in recession, the debt is unsustainable, and poverty, immiseration and hunger are here to stay. The politics of societal genocide will continue to be implemented because the system has no other solution, at least for the present. We have not yet seen the worst.

The overthrow of state and capital, social revolution is necessary for the survival of humanity, and to say this is not simple idealism. There is a need for a revolutionary movement to change the situation and to inspire people with the spirit of resistance and revolt.

After 35 days of struggle, I terminate the hunger strike that I began on March 2nd along with other comrades. I have decided to do so not owing to the fact that I have reached the limits of my endurance but because I believe that, considering the developments regarding the requestive context, this fight has completed its cycle and has exhausted its potential, taking into account also the solidarity acts that have taken place. I have chosen to suspend the hunger strike now, after the justice ministry's bill introduction, seeing no point in waiting at least 10 days until it's voted on, after Easter has passed. I however remain extremely cautious over any modifications that the ministry is supposed to present in relation to the hoodie law or DNA legislation; because the government has already demonstrated how unreliable it is in fulfilling its proclamations.

I participated in the hunger strike with a broken arm, having been injured during my arrest, a fracture that will take some time, perhaps months or over a year, to recover from. The demands which I supported alongside other imprisoned comrades are of a purely political character, because they are aimed against the "anti-terror" and repressive core of the State. I had no illusions from the outset that all of the demands, such as abolition of the 187A anti-terrorism law and the 187 law on criminal organisation, are "realistically" achievable, but they had to be put forward for political reasons.

The course of events showed that the SYRIZA-led government found itself in a very difficult position, but at the same time it's not as vulnerable to political pressure from the struggle of political prisoners and people in solidarity as some would like to believe. Instead, it is more vulnerable to pressure exerted by the right wing, where there's a greater sensitivity toward issues of "anti-terror" and repressive policy. Those who, while in opposition, claimed to have "fought" for the rights of prisoners, those who declared themselves against the "anti-terror" laws, such as the current ministers of justice and public order, those who declared themselves against the hoodie law, and have now come to power and lead the government, were faced with the first hunger strike of political prisoners aiming at a vindication of all that.

While in power, having within a very short time refuted everything they had proclaimed before elections regarding the memorandum and the debt, it is expected that they will leave the anti-terrorism legislation intact. Having accepted everything – the memorandum, the debt, the troika, the evaluation – they used to denounce while in opposition, having accepted the dependence on the International Monetary Fund and, by extension, the US – which means that it is impossible to repeal anti-terrorism laws – they chose to employ delaying tactics against the struggle of hunger striking political prisoners, and submitted an already proclaimed bill with whatever amendments only after one month, risking damage to the health and the lives of imprisoned comrades, as demonstrated in the case of comrade [Michalis] Nikolopoulos, who came close to death and may have suffered permanent damage. If this proves out, then this fight will come at a heavy cost; furthermore, it'll be an "achievement" of the leftist government led by SYRIZA, leaving an indelible mark because no other Greek government in the past let a hunger striker suffer permanent damage.

I will not speak in terms of victory or defeat. Regardless of its outcome, the struggle of political prisoners is of great importance and value. It is the first hunger strike of political prisoners, and as I've said before, this struggle goes far beyond its requestive context. It is the only combative political mobilisation that the SYRIZA-led government was faced with so far. This struggle has dispelled the illusions of a leftist facade of Power, a leftist crutch of capitalism, a leftist administration of the crisis. This is the great political legacy left behind by this struggle, and in this respect, we have definitely come out winners.

Nikos Maziotis, member of the Revolutionary Struggle

Greece: Statement signed by all the prisoners in the E1 wing of Domokos type C prison

February 27, 2015

Greece: Hunger strike and abstention from prison meals in E1 special wing of Domokos type C prison

A hunger strike was begun by comrades today in solidarity with Giorgos Sofianidis, a fellow prisoner in E1 special wing of the C prison of Domokos. Giorgos had been incarcerated in Korydallos prisons until the last day of December 2014.

He has been admitted to study at TEI Technological Institute in Piraeus and at the Institute of Professional Training of Koridallios. On New Year's Eve he was 'ghosted' to the category C prison of Domokos, although it is foreseen that those enrolled in Vocational Korydallos are not to be transferred to other prisons.

From today all the other prisoners of E1 wing are abstaining from prison food and refusing to re-enter the cells at noon.

We, all the prisoners currently held in the E1 special wing in the prison within the prison, the type C prison of Domokos, declare that as of today February 27th 2015 we are going to abstain from prison meals and refuse to enter the cells at noon.

We stand by our fellow prisoner, hunger striker Giorgos Sofianidis, and ask that he be moved

back to Koridallios prison [where he was incarcerated until New Year's Eve, in the same region where the educational institutions to which he has already been admitted are available], otherwise he risks losing any possibility to study at the TEI [Technological Education Institute] of Piraeus and the IEK [Institute of Professional Training] of Koridallios.

We demand that the special conditions of detention as well as the barbaric and inhumane type C prison be abolished.

Our mobilisations will continue until the type C prisons are permanently abolished.

Kostas Gournas

Nikos Maziotis

Dimitris Koufontinas

Giorgos Sofianidis [on hunger strike since 27/2]

Yannis Naxakis

Alexandros Meletis

Konstantinos Meletis

Vasileios Varelas

Mohamed-Said Elchibah

Alexandros Makadasidis

Domokos [type C] prison

I am no longer able to cope with this demanding hunger strike because I have exhausted my physical abilities to do so, owing to chronic health problems. I consider today's submission of the bill,* which initiates the fulfillment of some of our demands, to be the minimum threshold for suspending the strike.

Victory to the hunger strike of political prisoners.

Lamia, April 1st, 2015

Kostas Gournas



Nikos Maziotis, 28.6.2015

The SYRIZA government is collapsing. The Greek default and exit from the Eurozone, as the decision of the creditors, is a process that started in 2010 and currently marks the beginning of the end of the SYRIZA government. The implementation of the memoranda from 2010 was one phase in the process of controlled bankruptcy that the multinational economic elites had chosen in order to ensure the sustainability of the euro due to the debt crisis, to cut off one gangrened member that had to be expelled. Essentially the bankruptcy of Greece has always been regarded by the multinational economic elites as a prerequisite for its salvation, but for this to happen without changing the obligations of the country to its lenders was ensured by the subordination of the country to the authority of the IMF, the ECB and the European Commission. Since 2009, Greece was already a bankrupt country and this was something known by both the then government of George Papandreou and the European Union. The international economic elites, from 2010 onwards, followed a regular controlled bankruptcy so as to safeguard the creditors and also the holders of Greek bonds such as French, German, British and American banks.

The first aim of the Memorandum was that it prohibited unilateral default on the part of the debtor. On that basis, it tied up all the Greek public assets to ensure the repayment of the debt. Also the debt passed from Greek to Anglo-Saxon law and prohibited the conversion of euros into any undervalued national currency. The Greek State gave up sovereignty over its assets and passed all the jurisdiction to lenders. The second objective of the Memorandum by the administration of the prior loan of 110 billion euros and the replacement of the old debt with a new one, was the repayment of the then holders of Greek bonds and the transfer of debt to the international organizations of the IMF, ECB and EU member states. With this process of extension of Greek bankruptcy the holders of Greek bonds that were junk bonds were able to get rid of them with the least possible losses. This process continued with the PSI debt restructuring in March 2012 where the big winners were the foreign banks and the big losers were Greek banks, Greek pension funds and small investors. Parallel to this, the multinational economic and political elite turned the country into ruins, and using the dilemma “austerity or bankruptcy and disaster” for five years launched a policy of societal genocide and euthanasia for sections of the population, leading to thousands of deaths and poverty, hunger and misery.

The ultimate objective of lenders is to create a two-track European Union, with on the one side the strong and big surplus countries, and on the other side the weak indebted countries.

As we said as imprisoned members of Revolutionary Struggle in December 2010 in our text, *Let's make Greece the beginning of global social revolution*: “Our exit from the European Monetary Union is now considered a given to ensure the viability of the euro. But the debt crisis deepens and one European country after another will collapse economically in the near future, and it is difficult for the survival not only of the EMU but also the European Union. The most optimistic scenario for the future of the Union is to create a shape where strong and big surplus countries will lead and bankrupt countries of the European periphery will be transformed into protectorates, as they will cede entirely their economic and political dominance to the political and economic directorate of Europe. This treaty will promote the European Union by establishing a controlled bankruptcy mechanism”.

After almost five years this process takes shape with the bankruptcy of Greece in the European Union and its exit from EMU. Greece is the first country launched with the controlled bankruptcy process to inaugurate the European Union with two levels. All Greek governments, from 2010 until today, faithfully served these aspirations of the multinational elites.

The SYRIZA government is collapsing in a much shorter time than its predecessors, the Samaras and Papandreou governments. Despite the fact that within 5 months it renounced the plan for which it was elected, that it accepted the repayment of debt and signed the extension of the existing Memorandum No. 2, despite stepping over many of its red lines in the negotiations in order to sign a new Memorandum with lenders — an agreement they admitted themselves was not as gentle as the previous Hardouvelis measures — the lenders decided on Greek default and exit from the EMU with the obligations of course for the debt to remain intact. In five months in power SYRIZA proved how unrealistic was their program, how impracticable were Keynesian reforms pursued in a globalized neoliberal environment within the framework of the European Union, how contradictory it was to accept the debt repayment while seeking to increase the basic salary, to agree to privatization and want the state to be represented in the privatized companies, to request financing from lenders while not wanting to apply the terms that the 20 February agreement extended, to try to negotiate hard and then pass over red lines in agreeing to memorandum measures and which indirectly, with the new taxes and VAT increase, would lead to a further reduction of popular income, redundancies and increased unemployment. To think to blackmail lenders by threatening not to pay the installments, while one has signed on February 20 that there can not be a unilateral breach of debt payments and that Greek public assets are promised as security and can be seized as payment.

It is certain that all the while the lenders thought the SYRIZA government an unreliable partner and manager of the Greek crisis. The referendum decided upon by the government, to accept or not the proposals of lenders on July 5, is nothing else but the public relations management of its political shipwreck- accompanied by conspiracy theories about political coups and new caesars plotting overthrow.

But actually the SYRIZA government collapses under the weight of its own contradictions and its own deadlock. The referendum has no real material basis because 5 days before it, on June 30, the austerity program expires and the country is already in default status thus can not talk nor renew negotiation nor propose an agreement with its lenders. And the outcome of the referendum whatever it is will have no influence on the bankruptcy of the country and exit from the EMU is unavoidable. As well it will not avert the collapse of the government.

In the case of “Yes” in the referendum on the proposal of the creditors, the collapse of the government will be much more direct given that they formally drafted it in favor of the “No”. If indeed the majority who participate choose “No” it is possible for the government to gain a bit of time but it is completely incapable and unprepared to deal with the consequences of bankruptcy and exit from EMU, so sooner or later its fall is given. The referendum anyway is misleading because what really is at stake, namely the euro or drachma dilemma, does not provide any solution to the problems of the people.

As we have said as Revolutionary Struggle, Greece’s exit from the EMU and the adoption of the drachma in the European Union framework leaves untouched the problem of debt and does not negate the memorandum commitments. If terms of the Memorandum prohibit the conversion of debt by euros in any undervalued national currency, the adoption of the drachma will not reduce the debt but will only increase it. Also the adoption of the undervalued drachma would lead to further devaluation in the purchasing power of workers, and thus deterioration of living standards, which will further increase poverty and misery. Thus, the problem of currency alone does not solve the problem. Those who think that the exit from the EMU inside the European Union is a radical solution are grievously mistaken. Currently Greece’s exit from the Eurozone is following the same approach of lenders to downgrade a country to a protectorate within the framework of the European Union so it can be sold more easily to repay its debts.

Only action from below, only the action of a revolutionary movement that will topple capital and the state, will erase the debt, will pull the country out of the European Union itself, NATO and the market economy, would give a radical solution while proposing the reorganization of society on the basis of libertarian communism based on a confederation of communities, workers' councils and popular assemblies. Right now the political bankruptcy of SYRIZA, the bankruptcy of the country and exit from EMU, the consequences of which are unknown even to lenders themselves, leaves open opportunities for revolutionary forces to advance the prospect of overturn.

Abstention from the July 5 vote!

No to the false dilemma of Euro or Drachma!

The only solution is arming the people for social revolution!

Presentation of N. Maziotis at Atakton Steki in Patra, 7-12-2015, concerning the 2nd trial of Revolutionary Struggle [excerpt]

[Note: this is more or less the second section of the larger piece]

. . .In the communique where Revolutionary Struggle claimed responsibility for the attack on the Bank of Greece [in April 2014], the organization deconstructed the contradictory, impossible and unrealistic social-democratic program of Syriza which was then the political opposition and seemed like it might have the potential to take power; and we predicted its transformation into a purely neoliberal party that would faithfully implement the dictates of the international economic elites, just as its predecessors did. This took seven months of Syriza in government, from January to August 2015, when Syriza voted to confirm the third Memorandum against the will of 62% of those who voted in the referendum organized by the government (on July 5) and said NO to the requirements of the lenders.

In the same communique and towards the establishment of a revolutionary movement with clear political positions and proposals, we made a kind of revolutionary platform with positions for non-recognition and unilateral cancellation of all debt, exit from the eurozone and European Union, the expropriation of capitalist and state property and its socialization, the abolition of the state and its replacement by a confederation of popular assemblies and workers' councils that will manage everything- from production and distribution of goods, to health, education, defense and security of citizens- and proposed a dialogue in the anarchist/anti-authoritarian space concerning these positions.

And now currently there is being conducted the second trial of Revolutionary Struggle for the specific attack on the Bank of Greece, the Monastiraki shootout with police officers where I was arrested in July 2014, and for two bank expropriations made during the period that I was underground. Since being arrested, I have assumed political responsibility for the attack of the organization on the Bank of Greece, and now in the trial have already taken a stand for the attack on the Bank of Greece and the Monastiraki shootout, and I take responsibility for both expropriations of banks in Methana and Klitoria, which in the latter a policeman was wounded and disarmed.

Regarding the appeals court for the first trial of the organization which is also ongoing at this time, I do not expect any change in relation to the penalty nor do I care.

Finally, I would like to refer to the contemporary world and the prospects that exist. As I've already stated on the occasion of other events, in the period 2010-2012 a historic opportunity for the

radical space was lost because they did not make themselves into a political movement, into an identifiable political current with clear political positions and proposals aimed at conflict with the central authority and for subversion and revolution.

This is due to serious political shortcomings and political incompetence. This political failure is due to the lack of coherent positions and proposals for the struggle against capital and the state, a lack of understanding the importance of the crisis, the era in which we live, the policies of the regime, and the role of the state- and this has led in turn to the lack of proposals for a revolutionary social transformation and correspondingly to an absence of larger social and popular support, besides a section of the youth.

The movement over this same period devolved to dealing with economic themes - which are incorrectly considered as being the exclusive property of Marxists – but they did not understand the very nature and function of capitalism itself which is the paradigmatic economic-centered system. Meanwhile the favored preoccupation with political power, namely the State or even power itself, was limited to mere slogans without depth and lacking knowledge of the enemy we are supposed to defeat. Yet between them, the operation of Capital and the role of the State in today's world are inseparable.

For years, the main lines of action in the movement consists in the three words of Resistance - Solidarity - Insurrection. So when conditions presented a revolutionary perspective for Greece because of the crisis after 2009 and until 2012, which was the period of big mobilizations against the Memorandum, the anarchist/anti-authoritarian space found itself unprepared and politically disarmed on a theoretical and practical level. So in the years 2010-2012, with the large mobilizations against the Memorandum, with conflicts and a continuous siege of parliament by thousands of people, the opportunity for overturn was unexploited. After the flood tide of these mobilizations with the last being the February 2012 protests- all of which failed to act as even a minimum brake on the attack of the regime, precisely because they were defensive in nature and did not put forward a subversive perspective- now it is the low tide of social struggles, marked by resignation and defeatism, with many not only in larger society but also in the movement depositing their hopes in Syriza by going to the polls in 2012 and 2015. Thus it always has been in history that when people retire from the streets, then criminal professional politicians and the bourgeois parliament take the stage.

After February 2012, we have had a general ebb-tide of social resistance, struggles and strikes. All the strikes that were made since then - the two and a half years of the Samaras government, and those now in 2015 under Syriza as they voted in the summer for the third Memorandum- were small and dispersed. Nothing any longer inspires people, workers, and the youth to take to the streets because the methods of struggle, the 24-hour peaceful strikes controlled by establishment unions and parties, have no real effects and do not even make governments break into a sweat.

At the same time the radical space, along with the larger societal resignation and defeat, is experiencing its own political resignation and defeat, being unable to give answers to the fundamental problems of our time, experiencing an unhealthy state of introversion and with large internal divisions. The largest division which furthest reveals the contemporary deficiencies of the anarchist/anti-authoritarian space was over the coming to power of Syriza and the political investment of some of the space for the 'first left government'. And now that the last illusions and hallucinations were dissolved with the enactment of the Third Memorandum there still seems to be no prospect in sight to reverse the unprecedented social and class attack going on since 2010. But if we have to find those responsible for this weakness, let us look to ourselves- because while our era is most

fitting for subversive action and revolution, because the objective conditions are promising, because the system is in crisis and is discredited- as revolutionary subjects we are unable to rise to the occasion.

But our weakness is a result of a deeper social crisis that capitalism has caused over years. Decades of capitalist development and neoliberalism have finally corrupted western societies: the social fabric is broken, the collective spirit has been lost, solidarity as a key pillar of building human societies has been undermined, self-sacrifice for the collective good is no more. The values of the West, individualism, the consumerism that lasted until this crisis, and the dominance of technology have corrupted Western man and stripped him spiritually.

So now with the onslaught of multinational capital after 2010 as the result of the crisis, in countries of the European periphery and not only in Greece, societies seem to be unable to resist, as the depoliticisation and individualism resulting from Western culture has undermined collective social visions and hopes, and hence too, resistance. That's why people commit suicide through despair and loneliness. That's why revolutionary subjects fail to raise themselves above social defeat to propose solutions, to act selflessly and sacrifice effectively against the regime- and not by means of the comfort, self-sufficiency and self-referentiality of their small political shops.

In other times in Europe like the Second World War and before, radical subjects and people sometimes sacrificed their lives in much more difficult conditions than today, in conditions of war and brutal state violence, against poverty and exploitation and for a better collective future. It was then that social revolution as a process of advancing human progress took flesh, and was not an empty word, as at present.

Today, the society, people, and individuals need victories to revive their morale after so many years of blows and defeats from the authorities. To win these victories, however, we must make war normal, make serious sacrifices, to strike back and pay the bosses for their crimes, for all those who died because of the policies implemented, for all those forced to live out of the garbage, for all who live in poverty and destitution. We need to have proposals for a fairer society. We must be determined to make sacrifices, to risk our own lives, to pour out our own blood for the struggle, for a fight that does not concern only ourselves but a better humanity.

-Nikos Maziotis, member of Revolutionary Struggle

September 15th 2015:

It is a longstanding as well as an infamous tactic of the State — particularly of the police-judicial mechanism — to use fabricated charges against relatives so as to hold them hostage and put pressure on fighters and political prisoners. It was done in 2002 [*against Angeliki Sotiropoulou, wife of 17N prisoner Dimitris Koufontinas*], it was done in 2010 [*against Marie Beraha, wife of Revolutionary Struggle prisoner Kostas Gournas*], and it was done again in March 2015 [*against Evi Statiri, wife of CCF prisoner Gerasimos Tsakalos, but also against Athena Tsakalou, mother of the Tsakalos brothers*]. This is because the repressive policy applied against imprisoned members of armed organisations is an ongoing process of political extermination by any means.

After its capitulation on February 20th, the SYRIZA-led government was faced with the first class confrontation — that is, the hunger strike of political prisoners during Spring — and was compelled to vote favorably — among others – on an amendment that theoretically opened the way for the relatives of CCF members to be released. Today, after being refused her liberation six times by judicial councils, Evi Statiri, companion of an imprisoned member of the organisation, is still in prison. Her case is the clearest proof, not only of the acceptance of a state of emergency surrounding the memorandum by the government of the Left, but also of the strict application of a state of exception for political prisoners.

For those in society who had the clarity and determination to approach the ‘no’ vote in the referendum in a class manner and to oppose every memorandum, though without being able to take the next step forward, the question of an alternative way other than the one of delegation or relinquishment, which all the bourgeois parliamentary forces are charting, is more pressing than ever. And this is no other way than struggle and solidarity. Evi’s way...

SOLIDARITY WITH EVI STATIRI

on hunger strike since September 14th 2015



Excerpts from P. Roupa, *For a timely analysis of the present situation*

[Note: for understanding the crisis in the Greek movement of the past year, this is an extremely important text. For the present, these excerpts only cover some portions of the longer Greek text.]

Systemic crises are periods when major economic, social, and political changes appear, where unique opportunities for action and struggle for subversive movements are created. These are opportunities to the extent that can be exploited properly to irreparably undermine a shaky and unstable power system, but to the extent they are not used, from opportunities for subversion and revolution they can be converted into catalysts of internal divisions and conflict. The forms of action and struggle are called forth into *de facto* development to meet the new historical situation, and old forms of struggle that show themselves insufficient in front of present challenges obviously collapse. History itself is a challenge for those who struggle, especially for revolutionaries.

Against the current historical challenge we are all called to advance forward. And this not only because we as revolutionaries owe it to ourselves to grab unique historical opportunities and put into practice a revolutionary design, but because if we do not stand we equal to the task, if we can not fulfill our own historic mission, History itself will trample over us, perhaps destroy us. However, as the crisis deepens, nothing will remain the same. Large sectors of the political regime's bloc deteriorate, weaken, dissolve and some are threatened with extinction, while the attempt of Left intervention in the system collapsed with the Syriza government; new political dynamics will spring up as political extremes are reinforced, and what is at stake is who will occupy the political vacuum left behind by systemic crisis. It is known to everyone that nature abhors a vacuum, and this also applies for politics.

Although it is not at all pleasant to deal with specific political pathologies of the radical movement, I think I have at the moment no choice, since apart from presenting one's positions, some borderline situations like the present require grappling with issues operating counterproductively in terms of creating a revolutionary movement, issues which intensify and consolidate divisions among revolutionaries- and if you do not get past this political crisis it can reach conditions of generalized political cannibalism, although in some cases such cannibalism is already manifest. An important issue for me is to see in this context the issue of alignment for some or tolerance for others of leftist attempts to transform the system. These attempts clearly represent projects that not only do not promote revolution, but very effectively work to undermine it.

Since 2010 when Greece came under controlled bankruptcy with memorandums, we failed to capitalize on the opportunities presented to us in order to create a revolutionary movement of the quality, consistency, and dynamic range required in order to be a political catalyst to promote revolution in broader sections of the population affected by the brutal crisis. Instead, some invested in political forces foreign to revolution, such as Syriza, hoping that a leftist government would relax the pressure exerted previously by the neoliberal forces of the regime, both to the social base and to those who resist, and thought this would help to improve the conditions for the development of the movement.

In fact this trend- which some cultivated long before Syriza took power and many have always believed- was expressed in different theoretical and practical forms, and was a result of our individual and collective inability to build a revolutionary movement and to shape the terms of a genuine subversive struggle. As the rise of Syriza to power was the result of the defeat of social resistance

in the early years of the crisis, in an analogous way the aforementioned political tendency was and is a result of a political failure of the anarchist space in the same period. And because seeing deadlocks is contrary to my nature and political stance, I think the complete turnaround of Syriza into a neoliberal party totally identified with the lenders and a political bankruptcy which came in record time, can help to finish once and for all with any illusions concerning leftist political formations. This can help us clearly define matters, both as to the creation of a revolutionary movement and for the building of healthy revolutionary relations amongst ourselves.

A review of the last months is necessary to the extent that from previous elections and throughout the period following the coming to power of Syriza, the different perspectives and positions on the left government have served as the main background for a series of confrontations and warlike collisions within the movement. Another factor that makes this review even more necessary are the forthcoming elections [*note: those of September 20*], where it is certain for some and likely for others that in searching for the “new” political base and project for the movement they will find it in the new political group that emerged against the excess of Syriza’s austerity, pitting themselves as the “genuine Syriza” and using – once again- various crowns like resistance to lenders, in order to demand power.

If we want to see in real terms the creation of a revolutionary movement, we must free ourselves once and for all from any left political arrangement that flirts with power just as the dominant political forces are collapsing; we have to create our own design and help this project find the necessary social support in order to give impetus to the revolutionary perspective.

Syriza coming to power played a catalytic role in highlighting divisions and contradictions, which were mainly expressed through specific events and, as such, were lacking the basis of substantive discussion. And while Syriza went bankrupt politically bringing the third memorandum- which brought to light also the bankruptcy of any arguments from a portion of the movement concerning an attitude of tolerance towards them, by trying to make them seem different from the rest of the political elite, as well as having shared premises with them in certain events and policies- no account of the period that passed has happened, but this is necessary to enter the new period characterized by the bankruptcy of reformism in all its manifestations.

As a part of the anarchist/anti-authoritarian space consistently voted for Syriza in recent years without any political hesitation, it is the logical consequence that once Syriza came to power, divisions and conflicts would accompany many actions and would undermine any attempt at joint activity. A small peak of this division came on the occasion of the referendum. The final culmination of an internal conflict in the movement would have come if there had been a Grexit, which was avoided for the moment at least. And it is important to have some clear positions on what everyone professes, in particular clear political stances, because an explosive moment that might blow up, first of all, the actual subversive struggle has not disappeared from the horizon. And such a potential development in my view, can not be blamed either on power or the “pacified” society. The only responsibility will fall on us, especially on those who whatever their politics, base themselves on estranged authoritarian plans and targets.

But as for Grexit and what it would mean socially, politically, economically and within the country, I refer first to the period before the referendum and the period that followed. If some are pondering why I give such weight to the possibility of a Grexit and its effects, they probably do not realize the historical significance that it will have both for society and for radical forces. And above all, they do not see the assimilative potential latent in such a development. This is a dynamic that can convert a large portion of the movement, in the absence of a revolutionary plan, into reactionary defenders of counterrevolutionary policies aimed at remedying the system on new bases.

Well before Syriza was in power, a part of the space viewed the prospect of a government of the left as an opportunity for favorable treatment on a number of issues concerning the immediate interests of the movement, especially those concerning enforcement issues: the less harsh treatment by security forces in the streets, the better treatment of political prisoners, the softer treatment of comrades in courts were some of the “expectations” that a portion of the movement had for the government of Syriza. Based on the above, it was a consistent political choice of some to avoid frontal political confrontation with the government. And the protests and complaints recorded in public discourses or actions were mild pressure for the government to make a more...left turn- it being not at all obvious that these phrases contain subversive meaning and direction, even if their propagators like to believe that. Even after the agreement with lenders, while the government eliminated every excuse of anti-memorandum politics and acquired a completely neoliberal view, Syriza still enjoyed a peculiar political immunity. Perhaps because, under whatever circumstances and whatever this government does, some still insist that “it is in our interest for it not to fall.”

These “expectations” arrived, onto which were grafted in the previous months several theories about “sharpening antagonisms within the ruling class”: that if Syriza formed a government, it will automatically “favor the development of the movement.” In these cases, the expectation of a possible rupture with the lenders in recent summits amid the referendum and the prospect of exit from the eurozone had so far replaced the complete lack of revolutionary project that it made some who had invested in the probability of a rupture rave about the government’s decision to hold the referendum- until the harsh reality brought them back to earth.

The full integration of Syriza in the neoliberal framework and the void left behind as an anti-memorandum party will be attempted to be met with the new arrangement of LAE (Popular Unity), trying to bring back the illusions about the “abolition of memoranda”, for “tough negotiations” and “conflicts with lenders” and as a “banner” exiting the euro. Behind this new arrangement -with the inappropriate and unworkable policy which I will deal with later- is absolutely certain to crawl a portion of the radical space, reproducing a new base for the position of “strengthening ruling class rivalries for the benefit of the movement”, this view which has been orphaned following the identification of Syriza with the creditors.

What some should reconsider, beyond the futility of investing so much for small political interests (such as managing repression) in one tendency of a political regime that comes to power, is that it also is futile to expect that any difference within ruling sovereignty operate *de facto* in favor of subversive struggle by covering for the absence of a revolutionary movement. With that in mind, for some, the exit from the eurozone and the EU itself constitute a development that brings us closer to revolution (!). Without any approach to what kind of rupture, who causes it and why, without thinking of its effect on society, without analysis or only deferred analysis of the new situation and conditions that will arise, especially without an elementary revolutionary project for the exploitation of any new developments, any major rupture within the ruling order- rather than making a trench that will bury the system- may well be one that will swallow the revolutionary project. And this might happen because such a development will serve as the ultimate field of assimilation for a portion of the movement, where from anti-authoritarians they will turn into loyalist followers due to a vague political outlook of “exploiting inter-bourgeois rupture and conflict.”

It is always our job as rebels to operate in acts and therefore undermine systemic stability by any means. But when this effort is not accompanied by a revolutionary reason for our focus and prospects, only confusion can be caused both within the movement and in society more widely. And ensuring that the benefits of a systemic destabilization can be exploited in a revolutionary direction, matches

the continuous effort to develop a revolutionary movement with a clear design, with sincere positions and proposals to the base of society.

With their “good morning” to the coalition Syriza-ANEL, some people took care to make their position clear to the “new era”, making public their willingness to exit the frame of political conflict with authority. We read about the “deep state” that would exploit the situation (whether for agreement or a break with the lenders) to make “provocations”, thus not only heightening the price for any selection of political conflict against the government, but also to accuse that struggle as a provocation, especially if it acquired violent characteristics. The political scaremongering about “strengthening paramilitary circles”, for the “strengthening of the fascists”, for the action of the “deep state”, was beyond superficial, it was actually hostile to many comrades- especially those who chose not to make any truce in conflict with the central political power due to Syriza. But the most serious issue arising from this perspective is how it is constant and fixed for every possible political development and position-whether this development is a compromise with creditors or a break with them, every choice of violent social reaction to government will serve the “deep state”, the repressive mechanisms, and the fascists. Thus both anarchists and society, if they revolt against the government, will only play the game of “the deep state”, which will be benefitted in every scenario. And so as to “avoid the worst” (e.g. the return of New Democracy to power), it is necessary for the movement to give stable political immunity to Syriza at all times. And if part of society rose in revolt against the government, what would these people do? Would they stand against them?

Regarding the “change” in economic policy from Syriza, for some this would be in the “field of substantive rather than symbolic,” expected to “hit European fascism” and finally, “to tame European capital.” Obviously, this approach does not take account- or does not know- of the initial and current position of Syriza in favor of capital (and European capital) and the system in general, positions which are recorded in the analysis of governmental officials long before Syriza climbed to power (and which were incorporated into the strategy of the government in the days of Varoufakis); and at the level of the necessary systemic reforms needed to exit from the euro crisis, there is a great unanimity of their views with a portion of the international economic elite. And as far as electoral promises go, yes, these were clearly at the level of the symbolic. I refer to these in the text below in more detail.

Regarding the attitude of cops against actions of the radical space, I for one, like many other comrades, can list several cases under previous governments where heads of riot police squads either desperately sought confirmation from headquarters to allow them to “liquidate” us and this without there having flown a single stone, or they have tried to do so without orders. This happened in serious social protests and conflicts-either a single cop found the opportunity e.g. with the chanting of only one slogan, to attack causing a general police attack without any prior command. And never was there any position in the movement where we avoid actions that cause repression. This view just causes laughs because until recently it was ascribed as the official line only of the institutional left. Finally, for some it became a political “line” in the radical space. To protect who? Us?- but we have always had such phenomena from the cops, as I have said- or Syriza? But we never bothered to distinguish under any other government the regular repressive moves by the police, nor did we feel that any repressive policy was based on either the institutional right or extreme right vote of cops. Why do so over Syriza? And how is it possible to judge so accusingly the decision of some people, by demanding that they not march against this government under any circumstances?

To come back to “the deep state” in the case of rupture with lenders -a rupture that could only result from deadlock in the negotiations and would come from the lenders themselves- in such a case the only “deep state” would be Syriza and the far-right ANEL who would impose the most

brutal repression to maintain social peace in the case of a major crisis of relations between the Greek state and “the institutions” which could lead to Grexit. And somewhere here we should look for the importance of placing Kammenos in the leadership of the armed forces and the assurance that “the armed forces will preserve order in the country.” From such a position, and some variations thereof, another impetus was given to the conflict in the movement, as shown in smaller and larger examples. And based on the perspective of the “deep state” the Syriza coalition government was given *carte blanche* for every repressive offensive against militants, as some had the care from the outset to relieve the government of its responsibilities, this government which had “brought under control the autonomised segments of Greek police.” This would continue until the hunger strike of political prisoners dispelled this claim, and then there was unveiled the repressive policy of the government and its political opportunism in its attitude towards the demands of the hunger strikers.

The hunger strike of the political prisoners [~March 2015]

Before turning to the hunger strike of the political prisoners, which I believe was an important political episode with rich lessons and conclusions for the struggle, I say that what I write both in this section and throughout the text, is based exclusively on texts and facts that have been published. It is an historic fact that this strike ended with serious conflicts and confrontations within the movement. But in so much as there were expressed individual issues, attitudes and options, the basic causes of the problems were two: the different political stance towards Syriza, and negative attitudes and positions of some people against armed action. Regarding the latter, some publicly recorded in a text that the fact this particular strike concerned “people prosecuted for armed struggle constitutes a difficulty for many parts of the radical space to get involved”. And that “it was understood” and accepted by a large portion of space how some have given armed struggle “central political significance”. Now who or what organization puts at the center of struggle or has a hierarchy with armed struggle placed as all-important, this is the question to answer. At least with regard to Revolutionary Struggle both myself and my partner Maziotis, in writing and orally in central events and assemblies for what we do and do not consider key matters in the fight for social revolution, we do not consider any specific form of struggle as the most important and we are not recommending to form the “vanguard” of any kind. And because often repeated -until now practically constantly- this filological obsession by some to point out with anxiety the hierarchical practices and methods in the fight by Revolutionary Struggle, is probably stimulated by some kind of political complex of their own, because Revolutionary Struggle could not have given rise to such anxieties. As well, we have repeatedly said that an armed revolutionary struggle is not about weapons or tools like dynamite etc. but the political aims and strategy it has. And the same applies to any form of struggle.

From these two causes came all the other controversies, in whatever way or form they were expressed. The only exception were the anonymous attacks on the differences and confrontations during the strike which were the reason, or rather the pretext, for a coordinated attempt at the political isolation of comrade Nikos Maziotis. And some people thought that the opportunity was given for them to attempt the unthinkable: to isolate him from the organization, separating the comrade from Revolutionary Struggle. From this attempt there may be absent a political starting point, or at least not one included; but to target a representative in this way retains a political character. The attempts to isolate the comrade through mud and filth is finally an attempt to isolate Revolutionary Struggle itself. And such attempts at isolation, at political devaluation of Revolutionary Struggle were never attempted even by the state, save for the first days of arrests in 2010 and the failed attempt of ministerial and repressive mechanisms -an attempt eventually canceled by them- to tarnish the organization and us as fighters, as is recognized even by their own state institutions after years of militant presence and serious tests of repression, how Revolutionary Struggle was too hard for “their

teeth.” But some of “ours” had the audacity to try “from within.” And the worst of them did it anonymously, as befits vulgar mudslinging. A futile attempt for those who think to damage Revolutionary Struggle, above all because this is a task too difficult for their own non-existent “teeth.” I know that during the hunger strike some computer keyboards were “lighting up” for their premier chance to “hit” Maziotis. But really I give too little credit to myself and to him in referring at all to this laughable delirium, which only acted to the discredit of its exponents. Apart from some events that are worth mentioning, for the rest of what I have to say (for those who follow this narration), it is advisable to focus on political positions and the substance of events, to look at each political course, and avoid entering the trap of criticism based on style or good manners. And if one sees coordinated attacks against a comrade, one is a little bit suspicious. Because if anything was more surprising than the deficit in unity during the strike, it was how far this was outstripped by some in their rush to attack Maziotis.

At any rate, the hunger strike’s different political positions were two. One political position was the frontal political conflict with Syriza as expressed, at least, by comrade and member of Revolutionary Struggle, Nikos Maziotis. This willingness to make a common struggle against the government spearheaded the hunger strike, had been recorded in the first text of its start, and had long ago declared readiness to collide with any trend considering armistice in war with political power due to Syriza. Obviously there was the hope through this hunger strike to conduct a joint anti-government struggle of all political prisoners, creating the ground for a broader rallying of the movement and joint action against the coalition government that would contradict any tolerant positions for the government emanating from a portion of the radical space- further hoping that the success of such a broad rallying would contribute to the growth potential of a revolutionary movement. As to the texts of the other strikers at the start of the strike, in which they gave the political tone and when solidarity actions began, they did not involve the issue of conflict with the government. Later this issue came from the overwhelming majority of the strikers, like the issue of creating a radical movement. Finally, both on the ground and in the attitude of the strikers, was seen the necessity of a movement of solidarity with all political prisoners and the mistake of abandoning anyone for any reason in the hands of the state. In short, the logic of this strike- which was to attempt a concerted political conflict with the government of Syriza, to attack the repressive arsenal of the State, and to contribute to the development of a solidarity movement for political prisoners which raises the issue of creating a revolutionary movement- was correct. But with this perspective not everyone agreed.

Against the above issues raised mostly one way or another by most of the strikers, some outside the walls disagreed and undermined this strike by their own attitude. The solidarity movement undermined itself by playing up divisions, tending to cause a mood of distancing from “individuals” who made the strike and who were in prison for armed action. I believe, and since it has been some time from that strike so we can crystallize the main problems, that the base problem was the inability to create an expanded solidarity movement with increasing momentum which would support the strikers and would strengthen solidarity for each other and (at least to a large extent) prevent any conflict from ensuing. But as the strike progressed, the solidarity movement took on a descending note rather than strengthened and increased participation, an occurrence which so far is without any precedent.

Solely from negativity and their covert polemic with armed action some have made it a given for distancing or selective “solidarity” for some, which determines their stance in solidarity issues concerning why someone is imprisoned, driven by some kind of political insecurity lest their sympathy be attributed to the choice of armed action or lest they suffer some kind of political marginalization. Or lest there be imputed to them aiding the policy of armed organizations by giving the floor for prisoners to speak in solidarity events. That is, what they consider as solidarity is only their own view offered in their own speeches and the silence of those who put their crosshairs against the state and

repression- in this case the hunger strikers. And this, in the name of “maintaining political differences”, apparently makes it “reasonable” to jump to equating solidarity movements with political prisoners and organizations to whom some of them belong, all while underestimating -and I would say faithlessly- the comrades who sided with the struggle. Does this not mean downgrading solidarity to an issue of petty maneuvering politics? Is this not turning the strikers or imprisoned fighters into use-values to promote the speech of “our group”? And what is this “two-way relationship”, since in advance is excluded some consideration for the different reasons for the present partnership? And what is this kind of “solidarity”? . .

[NOTE: now there is a gap of a few pages dealing with the specifics of the hunger strike. . .]

. . .If someone thinks that a revolutionary movement can be built on the basis of exceptions and divisions in solidarity, they make a huge mistake. And as this text is coming out, E. Statiri is on hunger strike demanding her release from pre-trial detention, and I express my support for her and wish her strength and liberty, hoping that her demand and struggle will find a wide response. To close, this hunger strike was neither the first nor the last event to help define and clear up the attitude of the radical space towards Syriza. . .

The illusions of the “left confrontation with the imperialist center”

The referendum deserves a special mention, as it entailed a concentration of political positions concerning the government and a number of issues, but mainly because it brought to the fore the confusion caused by the absence of revolutionary design and perspective. Confusion is a non-negligible factor in political analysis, one which often manifests itself in various “erudite” approaches to the “inevitable” clash inside organized power and how this will deterministically benefit the struggle and the intensification of conflict.

The referendum and the voting I analyse based on two parameters. First, on the level of society. Regarding the ‘yes’ vote, I think things are quite clear. Where there is confusion is about the ‘no’ and abstention, and whether one or the other option serves the intensification of the struggle or not. To reiterate some of my positions on the referendum-or to clarify for whoever did not understand or did not want to understand- in the text I published before the summit in July, I spoke of many things, but not a single ‘no’. The social base for much of the ‘no’ that fell for voting, had a social and economic background and was a direct result of the pressure that austerity has brought on a large section of society. For some of those who voted ‘no’, it was the simple “I can’t take any more austerity measures” without political aims or strategies. And some of this ‘no’ had illusions that perhaps the referendum could be used by the government to prevent further harsh measures.

But towards the societal ‘no’ without a plan and strategy, we can not stand in the same direction as we do towards the ‘no’ of the radical space and various leftist parties and factions, which are supported by analysis and fit into some “strategy” for struggle. The approach can not be the same. For the sake of economy, let us remove from the discussion the ‘no’ of the Golden Dawn neo-nazis, since it is openly hostile to the revolutionary ‘no’. The important is to stick to at least some of the ‘militant, political no’ of the movement. What are the strategies and policies guiding this ‘no’? And most importantly, in default of any strategy at hand in the case of Grexit -conditions that would trigger the explosion of new political antagonisms- what would be their attitude, not only within

the radical space, but also to society?

Here I make a brief parenthesis to note that what I say in this document does not relate to people, but to political positions and trends like the ones that I see expressed through public discourse and debate. Because of my status in clandestinity I neither know nor want to know (and am completely uninterested in) who are the personal exponents of these views.

A general idea for many on the scene was that the referendum was an opportunity for the “sharpening of class contradictions.” Was this view based on the belief that the government would be forced come into conflict with the lenders if there was a majority ‘no’? Why should one blind oneself, consciously or unconsciously, in front of the given decision of the government to come to an agreement, not rupture, and to keep the country in the euro, a decision that was continuously expressed at every opportunity by Tsipras? For while it is wrong, in my view, for the society to vote “no” over the false dilemma that the government put in the referendum, on the other hand, it is truly tragic to invest politically in the government thinking it will move towards the sharpening of class contradictions, coming into conflict with creditors of its own will and supporting the interests of the poor. It is tragic to expect the government to go forward in conflict with the EU and lenders by serving the interests of the lower class and socially weak. It is also an illusion that can have tragic results, believing that any contradiction within the ruling powers can automatically boost a subversive movement.

And let’s suppose that they did not understand this and believed Syriza would not sign any agreement. That is, from a mistaken appraisal, politically investing in Tsipras who will “serve the people’s verdict”. But what did they do when Syriza signed the agreement? Where are the “unyielding” who preach “no means no”? And if they really believed in the revolutionary importance of this referendum, then they would have to raise the question of the defense of the ‘no’ with armed proletarian violence against, first of all, this government. And finally, how would they defend this? This new rhetoric of “no until the end” promotes and recommends the continuation of being trapped in reformist directions and new deadlocks. The same rhetoric is employed by the left tendency of Syriza that gave birth to LAE (Popular Unity) which claims the majority of the ‘no’ for the coming elections; various parties and factions of the left and a portion of the anarchist space show the new “alliance” that might be formed, with some of the space to follow this time the “drachma-ists” as the promising trend of the left that will “guarantee” to promote conflict with the EU.

The numbness that followed the Syriza-creditors deal in that part of the movement which promoted the ‘no’ was the result of understanding neither the government’s objectives nor the goals of the European economic and political elite, as well as the absence of any revolutionary design to exploit cyclical crises. This numbness was aptly recorded by the absence of any reaction to the agreement. In this, the conflict in front of the Parliament was a serious political barometer. Not for society, since its absence indicates that the referendum on its own was unable to reverse the social moods about a political confrontation with the government, but for the movement. And if anything should be admitted by all, it is that the few comrades who organized the clash in front of the Parliament saved appearances for everyone. And that goes as well for the political, militant ‘no’ parts of the movement.

At any rate, as I said above, the case of a Grexit (which the lenders would cause, not the government) could have been one that triggered the culmination of conflicts within the radical space. This is because that while it is a development that does not at all promise to promote the revolutionary project, nor even a frank confrontation with the elite, many in the space see the exit from the euro deterministically as “a step that brings us closer to the revolutionary goal” since it “will relieve us from the yoke of the big imperialist powers” such as Germany. The tragedy of this view, and the heavy cost it would bear not only for the space, but also for society itself, we can approach in all its heavy weight if we try to see in practical terms what it means to implement a Grexit. This development was avoided at the last

minute but did not disappear as a prospect and possible realization in the near or later future, and requires clarification here and now for all the political objectives and goals of the anarchist space, especially now that the trend of “drachma” has developed into coherent political entity, threatening first of all to digest -if it can swallow- the portion of the space that, until the agreement and the “betrayal” of the ‘no’, was favorably inclined towards Syriza. And this is not only because the situation itself requires a revolutionary perspective, but because first and foremost we need to avoid the height of an internal political drama and second, and most importantly, to avoid the peak of a drama for all of society.

The only rupture that could come and was averted at the last minute, as I wrote previously, was not that “from the government resisting the creditors”, as some in the movement wanted to believe. It would be one with the “partners” throwing Greece out of the euro. And this Grexit, do we realize what it would mean politically, economically, socially? Those who have reduced the exit from the EU to a guiding political direction, how do they perceive the sequel to such a possibility, since the crisis itself brings the country close to exit without much special effort on the part of the left government? And when it became clear that exit from the euro was promoted vigorously and systematically by a large part of the European economic and political elite, that elite of course having its continuity plan for Greece, in what terms and with what targets can we see this development as a positive for “the intensification of class conflicts”, as beneficial for struggle? Or is it that the *de facto* acceptance as a positive development a Grexit -in whatever fashion and however it arrives- and the belief that by itself it would “liberate revolutionary dynamics”, is this gradually leading to a total societal integration and a resignation estranged from revolutionary projects?

To make clear what I mean, I need to make a return to recent political developments. In short, the government decided to proceed to the referendum when it was at an impasse both on the part of the lenders, and on the side of internal party conflicts. I believe that everyone now realizes the original plan of the government was to exert a pressure on the lenders to sign an agreement in a slightly modified shape from the existing one, believing that they would not reach the edge of the cliff due to the “inability of Europe to risk a Grexit”. With this plan months passed, all the time increasing the financing needs of the Greek state and making it increasingly difficult for the government’s position to hold. As the stalemate deepened, monetary reserves had dried up and the government realized that the “honorable compromise” would become dishonest compromise and that lenders do not bluff, and the government was coming closer and closer to the possibility of leaving the euro, reasoning that it could come as a result of a deadlock on the side of the “partners”, and for which the responsibility would be European, and not their own. This solution, as demonstrated by the events, was promoted by part of the European economic and political elite, with leaders of the governments of the North, but was processed and concretized by all the EU leaders, including the European Commission, which prepared the most complete report dealing with it.

The government wanted an agreement at any price, and only the different policies and the threat of conflict inside the ruling party created obstacles to achieving it. And the referendum’s guiding strategy was for the ‘no’ vote to lose, and not the opposite, since this would legitimize the government to overcome the contradictions inside Syriza and would legitimize the agreement based on the “people’s verdict”. And that explains all the phrases of Tsipras both during and upon completion of the referendum: “From this referendum there will be no winners and losers”, “we do not want a break”, “we do not want division”, “Come Monday and we’re all together”, and much more. But much of the organized movement and political militants, with the ‘no’ of the government, celebrated at Syntagma or perhaps were ravished while Tsipras explained as clearly as he could that the ‘no’ for the government was irrelevant. To tell the truth he did his best to defeat it. And the result was that it brought a very difficult position for the government to manage, which now had to convince lenders that the ‘no’ was, after all, “yes to the euro” as propagandized by the entire European political elites and political parties of the local constitutional establishment, that it was “no to no agreement”, “no to rupture.” . . .

The rupture with lenders, still defended by some former officials of Syriza in current conditions, opens serious questions that must be answered. What does it mean, practically, the Grexit offered by lenders? Generally it constitutes a kind of economic, political and social quarantine for Greece, where things will look more like a failed state with refugees that survives on the medicines and canned foods of Europeans in exchange for a “partial remission of debt”. It is the bankruptcy of a state. This is currently proposed by Schauble and by the European Commission.

A number of useful lessons can be learned through the facts and it should not be skipped, concerning the positions adopted by some anarchists against “German imperialism”, which they set as the peak of their activity. These reflections come to respond, with seriousness and composure, to some questions raised through recent events. Ultimately what does ‘German imperialism’ want for Greece? Within or without the euro and the EU? What does ‘German capital’ want to do in Greece? And where is the conflict of interest with ‘Greek capital’ when the latter wants desperately to keep the country in the euro? Why was Grexit a common target for a portion of the German government and a portion of the leftist government? And not for some Grexit different from that promoted by Schauble, since neither side anywhere saw subversive action as a plan amidst such a development nor was there a different proposal to exit the euro. This is quite simply because it didn’t exist. It is obvious -and this is proved not by a long ideological confrontation, but by particularly stubborn historical events- that some people’s method of analysis leads to problems, since in this way they cannot even deal with reality, let alone try to make predictions. And because each climax of subversive action involves broader proclamation of the struggle to which we invite ever-larger sections of society to participate, each time we aim at something as the main enemy, this is the target that most involves our aims of wider subversive crisis and has little potential to resist that.

Therefore, if one sees as the principal enemy another European state, and specifically its policy in a given period (in this case Germany) where precisely is the revolutionary perspective of a wider subversive social struggle? Is Germany, or German imperialism as is claimed, the main enemy of Greek proletarians? And if German policy did not apply a strict monetarist view and impose on the weaker eurozone economies austerity policies and fiscal discipline, if it followed the suggested direction encouraged by many of the transnational (like Soros) economic elite and many of the political elite (including Keynesians, including Varoufakis), exerting a hegemonic imperialism through policies of redistribution of the surpluses of the North, would it still be the same enemy of the Greeks? Will you find any real basis to it, or it is mainly rhetoric, this German imperialism? And why does the whole mob of rulers worldwide exert fierce criticism of German policy, by charging it with the very fact that it refuses to fully assume the role of a hegemonic imperialist power in Europe, and that this refusal is a major reason for the fact that European crisis deepens more and more? And after all, who places the social and class revolution in a project that can include all the domestic elite, as they apparently also “suffer from German imperialism”?

I am deeply convinced that the comrades who adopted and promoted these positions would do well to review them in light of new developments of class rule in our time and the new features of the crisis, for which methods of analysis imported from prior historical periods are not sufficient. . .

[NOTE: the text continues further in this vein, but as we’ve covered the major events of the past year, this is the end for this selection of excerpts. . .]

Some Questions and Answers with N. Maziotis, event at Karditsa self-managed space, June 2016 [excerpts]

Q. How can the anarchist/antiauthoritarian space change from being reactive into a real revolutionary movement? In your opinion, what political characteristics should it have, and what kind of organization and aims?

A: It is a question of political positions. Anarchy, or Libertarian or antiauthoritarian communism is a social proposal and organization. The condition to create a truly revolutionary anarchist movement is the existence of political positions and proposals in order to make clear to the people, the masses and workers, what we believe and what aims we have as anarchists. This means that we must take positions on the burning problems and issues of our time that are the result of the capitalist crisis- such as debt, memoranda, the dilemma of staying in or leaving the European Union, and to make clear what is our goal as anarchists, which is none other than the overthrow and destruction of capital and the state and the creation of a stateless, classless society.

These are issues for which the masses of people, the people affected by the crisis and the policies for rescuing the system, have searched and still search answers, yet the anarchist/anti-authoritarian space had nothing different to offer them compared to the proposals of the mainstream parties (besides slogans perhaps). Also beyond the formulation of political positions and proposals it should be clear by whom or in what ways and means our struggle will promote and implement these political positions and proposals- in other words, how we will make Anarchy a reality.

So if we want to make revolution and overthrow capital and the state and to create a revolutionary movement aimed at this stateless and classless society, then we must necessarily have armed struggle in our practice as a means of struggle. Because as I said in my presentation it is obvious and a given that no revolutionary perspective is possible without armed struggle. Of course a revolutionary movement must have diverse methods of struggle, it must have all the different methods as so many arrows in its quiver: propaganda, counter-information, demonstrations, self-organized structures, and there must be open and public, as well as illegal actions.

But all these actions must be part of a larger package that serves the same purpose, the overthrow of the regime. For this it is indispensable to have the greatest possible agreement among comrades on unified political positions and proposals, in a kind of political program. Otherwise we simply reproduce the characteristics of the current movement, which is a patchwork of groups and individuals, which is neither a unifying nor a united force and where all have different priorities, and therefore it remains a purely reactive political space, only for protest or at best insurrection, but it can not become a threat to the regime nor have a revolutionary perspective.

Regarding the organization that a revolutionary movement must have, it depends on the political positions and proposals we have. Since it seems today that nothing can be taken for granted, if we are anarchists, we are supposed to aim for the immediate abolition of the state as a mechanism to administer societal affairs and the destruction of capital. If our positions and our goals are the destruction of capitalism, the market economy and the state, leading to the creation of a stateless and classless society- that is, a confederal organization where the societal units are the communities, communes and collectives where the decisions are taken by assemblies of the people who make up these social organizations- then the organization of the anarchist revolutionary movement is quite obviously federal.

Because our organizational set-up is our social proposal in miniature, it is Anarchy in miniature. In such a case, anarchists already within their organizations do act as a microcosm of what they profess and support. Inside the old is born the new, but not by reproducing the old hierarchical structures and values of the world and society we want to change. This is very important, because previous revolutions

in fact failed in their objectives because they reproduced these hierarchical values and structures in a slightly different way.

True communism means a society without a state. The difference between Marxists and anarchists is that in the process leading to communism, Marxists believe that there should exist in the transition from capitalism to communism, the so-called “workers state” or “dictatorship of the proletariat” and that later, when the conditions have matured and the class enemy is defeated, the state will simply dissolve itself. Whereas, in contrast, anarchists believe that the state must be dissolved and destroyed immediately without any transition. Historical experience has shown that no state dissolves itself, various pretexts are given for its preservation, and that no privileged caste resigns its privileges and gives up its power in the management of human affairs.

As shown in the example of the Russian Revolution of 1917-21, instead of the assumed self-dissolution of the state, there was created the most authoritarian and totalitarian state, and this was a bad example for the labor movement and anti-imperialist struggles and revolutions in the Third World, which reproduced regimes that imposed full nationalization of the economy, along with the dictatorship of a bureaucracy that reproduced class divisions.

In the case of anarchists in the example of Spain, they proved what Saint-Just said in the French Revolution, that “those who make revolutions halfway only dig their own grave”. The Spanish anarchists- and they achieved major gains in terms of self-management in most of the Spanish territory where, thanks to their efforts, the Franco coup was suppressed- did not topple the two governments, both the local one of Catalonia and the central government in Madrid of the Popular Front, all in the name the anti-fascist struggle, with this resulting in constant concessions and repression of self-management by the Communist-controlled government.

Future revolutions must not repeat past mistakes, and must dissolve the State directly as a mechanism of class-rule. We must promote this today as anarchists and we must show our political positions as a movement.

In February comrade Roupa attempted to help your getaway from the prison of Korydallos by [hijacking a] helicopter. Could you make a comment about this?

It was an action forming part of the framework of the continuation of action that Revolutionary Struggle has engaged in since 2009 at the beginning of the crisis, targeting the mechanisms and economic power structures that play a significant role in the crisis and its political representatives (Athens Stock Exchange, Eurobank, Citibank) and continued with the last attack of the organization in 2014 on the Directorate of the Bank of Greece and the IMF permanent representative office, for which I was recently sentenced to life imprisonment.

This escape attempt was a response to repression against Revolutionary Struggle and against other armed fighters, and in this context included in the escape were members of the CCF. Despite the failure of this attempt, it is of great political value and importance.

As Revolutionary Struggle, we have made choices that have brought us face to face with state repression, prison, and we have risked our lives in this combat. For us, prison is a terrain of struggle, not the end of the fight, and we have proved that it was not the end with the arrests in 2010. To defend with pride what we are, and to continue the armed struggle is a duty and right, and it is our especial duty towards Lambros Fountas, our comrade who was killed in action, it is a matter of course for us and negates the repression.

Such actions as comrade Pola Roupa attempted are exemplary because they give a strong political message that we are and remain consequent, despite successive repressive operations of the state against us, despite the arrests, heavy sentences, and murder of Lambros Fountas, we are unrepentant and we will not stop struggling, we will never throw in the towel, we will never give up the fight.

Also the fact that the escape would have included members of CCF demonstrates further that there is not so much importance in different positions about issues concerning the struggle, but that what matters is the common goal, the struggle against authority, the struggle for the overthrow of capital and the state.

Lately it is possible to observe a large deficit of solidarity towards all political prisoners. This was particularly illustrated by the massive political prisoners hunger strike of 2015. What do you think is the cause of this?

In my estimation, this is a result of the general political failure, or if you like, the political defeat of the anarchist/anti-authoritarian space over the last six years where, first of all, it was not up to the historic occasion, it could not intervene as a catalyst in the period after the inclusion of the country in the programs of international organizations of the Troika, and secondly, due to the fact that the terrorism of the state started to bite, with the waves of repeated arrests for armed action the 2009-2011 period, a result that brought into prison dozens of comrades who have been sentenced to many years of prison, and that there exists the perspective that they will remain fairly long years in prison.

On the issue of solidarity there were simultaneous problems of separations, with criteria as to why someone was accused and what attitude they held, that is if they were “guilty” or “innocent”, if they took responsibility for participation in an armed organization or invoked a judicial “fabrication”. There were criteria of “solidarity” based on personal or family relationships, or the criteria that, “anyone I disagree with, I am not in solidarity with”.

In recent years we have witnessed many such separations using various criteria. All these divisions have basically a political background behind them, such as the exclusion of armed action as part of the fight against state and capital.

So a piece of the anarchist space has proven to be easier to mobilize on issues of “human rights” since they are considered more popularizable, with the issue of judicial “fabrications”, “unjust persecutions”, “construction of cases”, all this rather than of course the armed struggle cases for which the vast majority of the political prisoners are in prison, and many of whom have accepted political responsibility for their participation in armed groups.

But now there is a general indifference and a general deficit in solidarity towards all political prisoners, not just for one portion, and is irrespective of divisions and regardless of any controversy, and this is due to the political defeat of the anarchist/antiauthoritarian space in recent years. This defeat is the result of serious political shortcomings and incapacities, that it has no coherent political positions and proposals to the problems of our time, the crisis and policies to oppose it. So it could not intervene in the period of big mobilizations against the 1st Memorandum in 2010-12 and was unable to develop into a serious political pole, a revolutionary movement that would be a threat to the regime.

This general political defeat affects the overall activity of the movement and has led to the present resignation and fragmentation- particularly visible in the last rallies against the 3rd Memorandum- and of course this too affects the question of solidarity with political prisoners. Naturally, the movement is also influenced by the general social defeat, after the mobilizations against the memoranda and rescue programs implemented over the past six years have all been defeated. From 2012 there has been a decline in social resistance and a lessening of mobilizations made against the governments of Samaras and of SYRIZA.

The overall political failure and defeat of the anarchist/anti-authoritarian space to develop into a revolutionary movement that has the potential for subversion and revolution is the cause of the deficit in solidarity with all the political prisoners, and not just for those that might be said to have responsibilities for various confrontations between prisoners, and which in some degree are caused between views of “innocence” and “guilt” and the issue of assumption of political responsibility.

To sum up, the problem of the anarchist space is an existential political one. It has forgotten the war against authority, and therefore has forgotten its own prisoners of war.

Under other circumstances, this text would be written by Revolutionary Struggle. However, the outcome of the attempt to break out the comrade Nikos Maziotis of Koridallos prison obliges me to speak personally.

On February 21st [2016], I attempted to break out Revolutionary Struggle member Nikos Maziotis by helicopter. The operation was planned so that other political prisoners could join us, who wished to make their way to freedom. Details of the plan, how I managed to evade the security measures and board the helicopter armed, have no special significance and I will not refer to them; despite the fact that there has been a lot of misinformation. Just for the sake of clarity, I will only mention that the plan was not based on any previous helicopter prison escape, it is not associated with any findings of plans not yet implemented, and I do not have any relation to another fugitive person despite media portrayals to the contrary. Also, this attempt was not preceded by any escape plan that “was wrecked”, as reported by some media.

A quarter of the journey after our takeoff from Thermisia in Argolida, I took out my gun and I asked the pilot to change course. Of course, he did not understand who I am, but he realised it was an attempted prison break. He panicked. He attacked me pulling out a gun – a fact he “omitted”. Also because they will likely try to refute the fact he was armed, I remind everyone that there are publicly available reports about the discovery of two mags in the helicopter. One was mine, but the second wasn’t mine. The second mag was from his own gun, which he dropped from his hands during our scuffle during flight. And as for me, of course I had a second mag. Would I go to such an operation with only one mag?

He lost control of the helicopter and shouted in panic “we will get killed”. The description that was presented of a helicopter substantially unmanageable is true. But these images did not result from my actions, but his. The helicopter was losing altitude and swirled in the air. We flew a few meters over electricity wires. I screamed to him to pull up the helicopter, to do what I tell him so no one will get hurt.

Within no time at all, we were on the ground. Those who speak of a dispassionate reaction of the pilot, apparently judging from the result, don’t know what they are talking about.

Instead of doing what I told him to do, he preferred to risk crashing with me in a collision of the helicopter, which didn’t happen by chance. It goes without saying that upon entering the helicopter and trying to gain control of it, to direct it to the prisons, I had made my decision. If he refused to do what I told him, I would naturally react. Those who claim I was responsible for the uncontrolled descent of the helicopter, from 5,000 feet to the ground, what did they expect? That I would have said “if you don’t want to come to the prisons, never mind”? I fired my gun and we engaged – both armed – in a scuffle during flight.

He preferred to risk crashing with me on the mountain than to obey. When we finally landed on the ground with speed, even though I knew the operation was lost, I had every opportunity to execute him. I consciously decided not to do so. Although I knew that with this decision I was endangering my life or freedom, I did not execute him even though I had the chance. He himself knows this very well. The only factor that held me back was my political conscience. And I took this decision, risking my own life and possibility to get away.

Regarding the prison escape operation itself, it’s obvious that all possible safety measures were taken in order to safeguard the undertaking against the armed guards patrolling the prison perimeter, and I even carried a bulletproof vest for the pilot as well. In this case, the purpose was to make the prison

break happen in a way that would ensure the lowest possible risk for the helicopter, the comrades and, of course, the pilot. I acted with the same thought when we landed on the ground; despite the fact that the operation failed because of the pilot; despite the fact that he was armed. I essentially put his life over my own life and safety. But I am to reconsider this specific choice.

Organising to break out Nikos Maziotis was a political decision, as much as it was a political decision to liberate other political prisoners as well. It was not a personal choice. If I wanted to only liberate my comrade Nikos Maziotis, I wouldn't have chartered a large helicopter – a fact that made the operation's organising more complex. The aim of the operation was the liberation of other political prisoners as well; those who actually wanted, together with us, to make their way to freedom.

This action, therefore, despite its personal dimensions that are known, was not a personal choice but a political one. It was a step in the path to Revolution. The same goes for every action I have carried out and for every action I will make in the future. These are links in a chain of revolutionary planning aimed to create more favourable political and social conditions, for broadening and strengthening revolutionary struggle. Below I will refer to the political basis of this choice; but first I have to talk about facts, and the way I have operated until now in regard to some of these facts.

As I previously mentioned, every action I carry out concerns an act related to political planning. In the same context, I expropriated a branch of Piraeus Bank on the premises of Sotiria Hospital in Athens last June [2015]. With this money, in addition to my survival in "clandestinity", I secured the organising of my action and financing of the operation for the liberation of Nikos Maziotis and other political prisoners from Koridallou women's prisons. The reason I refer to this expropriation (I couldn't care less about the penal consequences of this admittance) is because, at this time, I consider it absolutely necessary to disclose how I operate in regard to the safety of civilians, who in certain circumstances happen to be present in revolutionary actions I am involved in, and my perspective about this issue on the occasion – always *mutatis mutandis* – of the prison escape attempt.

In the case of the expropriation of Piraeus Bank branch, what I mentioned to the bank clerks when we walked into the bank was that they should not press the alarm button, because this would endanger their own safety, since I wasn't willing to leave the bank without the money. I did not threaten them, nor would they ever be in danger because of me. They would only be in danger because of the police, if cops arrived at the spot and we subsequently had an armed clash. And the police would only arrive if any clerks pressed the bank alarm. This was a development which they themselves wanted to avoid. Because people who happen to be present in every such action are not afraid of those trying to expropriate, but instead the police intervening. Besides, it's really stupid for anyone to attempt to defend money belonging to bankers. And for the record, when a female clerk told me "we ourselves are also poor people," I suggested to her that we step over to a "blind" spot, where cameras can't see us, to let her have 5,000 euros, which she did not accept, apparently out of fear. If she had accepted the money, she can be sure I would not speak publicly about it. And one detail: what I was holding was a medical apron to conceal my gun while waiting outside the bank; it was not a towel(!), as mentioned several times.

In every period of time, in the struggle for Revolution – as is also the case in all wars – at times the revolutionaries are obliged to seek the assistance of civilians in their fight. The historical examples are too many – an attempt to document them would fill an entire book, and this isn't the time to expand on the matter – both in Greece and in armed movements and organisations in other countries. In such cases, however, we essentially ask them to take sides in a war. Once someone refuses to assist, their stance is not just about the particular practice, but an overall hostile stance against the struggle. They endanger or cancel undertakings, they put the lives of fighters in danger, they throw obstacles in the way of a revolutionary process. They take a position against a social and class war.

Neither at Piraeus Bank branch nor during the attempted helicopter escape did I make my identity known. Therefore, no one involved in these cases knew that those were political actions. But after the failed escape attempt, and given that – as I already mentioned – I had the opportunity to kill the pilot but I didn't, risking my own life, I have to make the following public: from now on, whenever I need the assistance of civilians again, and if I deem it necessary, I will make my identity known from the outset. Since my mission in any case concerns the promotion of the struggle for overthrowing the criminal establishment, let everyone know that any possible refusal of cooperating and effort of obstructing the action will be treated accordingly.

I am, of course, aware of the personal details of the pilot, but I did not threaten his family. I would never threaten families and children.

This is my balance sheet after the escape attempt, one I must make public.

THE PRISON ESCAPE OPERATION WAS A REVOLUTIONARY CHOICE

[...]

I ATTEMPTED THE PRISON ESCAPE FOR SOCIAL REVOLUTION

ALL MY LIFE I STRUGGLE FOR SOCIAL REVOLUTION

I WILL CONTINUE TO STRUGGLE FOR SOCIAL REVOLUTION

Pola Roupa

member of Revolutionary Struggle

Statement of N. Maziotis at ongoing trial of Revolutionary Struggle

The armed attack of Revolutionary Struggle against riot police in Exarchia was one of the most important actions of the organization. It was a legitimate political and social action in retaliation for the murder of 16 year-old Alexandros Grigoropoulos by the policemen Korkoneas and Saralioti, which took place on December 6, 2008. This murder was the result of the intensification of police violence in recent years, and was formed under conditions of intensive neoliberal reforms and the “war against terrorism” in the same period.

In particular, this development took on larger dimensions in the spring of 2007, when there were violent clashes and attacks in the center of Athens between students, youths and anarchists against squads of riot police, in the protests that were against the bill of the Ministry of Education to promote the privatization of education.

The then minister of Public Order, Byron Polidoras, when taking office truthfully addressed the police as “Praetorians”, and when after these riots followed anarchist attacks on police stations in Exarchia and Papagos, he had stated that “the police have steady nerves” and can safely pull out their guns. Essentially, this more or less gave the green light to fire against unarmed demonstrators, youths and anarchists. At the same time there was a climate promoted by the state and the Ministry of Public Order, with declarations from this same minister and also the police union, promoting the cleaning of anarchists from Exarchia, speaking of the reclamation of Exarchia for the state. A similar debate and counter-debate exists now between Syriza government and the main opposition party of New Democracy.

Revolutionary Struggle had warned in April 2007, when we bombed the 2nd police station of Nea Ionia in Perissos, that the intensification of police violence would result in deaths from police fire-

and that in this case we would answer in the same way. Indeed, this intensification of police violence came to pass a year and a half later, as a patrol car wound up in a skirmish with some youths on Messologi street in Exarchia, and ended with the murder of young Grigoropoulos by “brave” Korkoneas and Saralioti.

Revolutionary Struggle (consistent with the warning given when we attacked the aforementioned police station) proceeded with attacks against riot police, initially in Kokkinopoulou in Zografou, as a dress rehearsal, and then in Exarchia on January 5, 2009, at the intersection of Kountouriotis and Zaimi streets, where there were standing guard three riot police. This operation, apart from the tangible results, with one seriously injured riot policeman, whose life was spared by luck, with his two immediate colleagues looking only to save their own lives, and the other cops unwilling either to help them or to pursue the members of RS, has a broader political significance.

The political significance of this action was not limited only to a retaliatory action for such a murder, but was much greater. Revolutionary Struggle, in interpreting the signs of the times (such as the outbreak of the global financial crisis that began in the US in 2007 with the bursting of the bubble of subprime loans, and which globalized with the collapse of Leaman Brothers in September 2008) and given the precarious state of the Greek economy due to its high debt, predicted a period of turbulence, a period of structural destabilization, as the country was entering into the vortex of the crisis from 2009 onwards, and since the government would be forced to take measures that would cause the social delegitimization of the system. Effectively, Revolutionary Struggle predicted in 2009 the epoch of memoranda and austerity policies, with the IMF directives that would be imposed on the country.

In these times, when the system is in crisis- economic crisis, crisis of the political system of representative democracy, a crisis of confidence and legitimacy in the eyes of the majority of society- this period opens up, in our view, an opportunity to attempt a break with the financial and political system, to make a revolutionary attempt by making a strong revolutionary organized political force, a revolutionary movement which would use armed struggle to overthrow capital and the state.

The uprising of December 2008, the greatest youth uprising in modern Greek history (and indeed perhaps in Europe in recent years), was a response to the Grigoropoulos murder, and embarrassed the regime to the point of it considering the possibility of declaring martial law. This showed the explosive conditions of rage underlying Greek society at the time when the regime was initially faced with the crisis, which a revolutionary movement could exploit to overthrow the regime.

Before the killing of Grigoropoulos by the policemen Korkoneas and Saralioti, Revolutionary Struggle had designed strategic actions in order to hit structures, mechanisms or persons of the economic and political system that were responsible for the crisis and its management. In the autumn of 2008 we had already decided to hit the Athens stock exchange with a large payload of explosives, but after the murder of Grigoropoulos the organization decided to postpone this campaign of actions and attack the forces of repression.

Revolutionary Struggle, in the notice which claimed responsibility for armed attacks against riot police, clearly stated that an attempt to overthrow the regime in crisis necessarily includes armed struggle, which is needed in order to eliminate the regime’s security forces.

The attack of the organisation on the three police riot on January 5, 2009, which resulted in serious injury to one of them, and the reaction of inertia from the other two and from the rest of the squad stationed a few paces further down on Bouboulinas Street, showed that a few fighters, formally untrained, with their will and determination can neutralize and render these praetorians of the regime, the police, unable to react. This would be a useful political lesson, if there were to be formed a revolutionary movement in the immediate future, which would use armed action to undermine and overthrow the regime in general.

Imagine for example, what would have happened if at least part of the thousands of people who repeatedly tried to storm the parliament in the period of the memorandum votes, like in May 2010 or in February 2012, had possessed weapons. In this case, no police force, no force of riot police or EKAM, would have been capable of stopping an armed people determined to seize the parliament- this lair of the political executioners of the people, of those who are the instruments and servants of foreign and local usurers, the banks, multinationals, the mechanisms of international capitalism, all of those responsible for implementing austerity programs that have led to widespread poverty, misery and thousands of deaths.

Revolutionary Struggle advocated with this attack for an armed Athenian Commune in following the example of the Paris Commune of 1871, the first armed proletarian revolution. This is actually the great political significance of this attack. That only by a revolution will society, the people, the workers be freed from the shackles of capital and the state, and that the use of armed struggle is essential and necessary to defeat the security forces that protect the state and the capitalists. The attack on January 5, 2009 was a small confirmation of this position and, as Revolutionary Struggle, we bequeath this political legacy to society.

Some excerpts from N. Maziotis, member of Revolutionary Struggle, presentation at Pikrodafne squat, Athens, 31/1/2016

“We have to sabotage the implementation of the Third Memorandum”

Q: What are the reasons, in your opinion, for the decline in the level of social resistance and struggles against capitalist restructuring and austerity measures and how can we get out of this impasse? What should be the strategy in the anarchist space currently?

A: The cause of the lessening of social resistance is precisely that it had and continues to have a defensive character in face of the unprecedented onslaught of capital and the state after 2010. The capitalist machine has been malfunctioning since 2008, neither finding profitable investments for pumping out ever greater profits nor capital to offset its losses, so it attacks social gains and the working class. And it attacks social security, salaries and pensions, it confiscates property due to debts, reduces labor costs, and seizes public property through privatization.

To compensate for its losses, capital pushes through rescue programs, that is to say the memoranda, wiping out sections of the population that it neither wants to nor can exploit, leading to their destruction. The redistribution of large-scale social wealth by confiscation applies a large-scale policy of theft from society and societal genocide to save the powerful.

Faced with this unprecedented attack that has already left thousands dead and the majority of society immiserated and impoverished, the solution is not to struggle to restore the system and social order to pre-2008 conditions- when the system worked, the banking system was “prosperous”

and giving loans, with a welfare state (which in Greece was never well-developed) and a social consensus on the neoliberal reforms of that time.

It is impossible to go back to that situation because of the dynamics of the system itself. Just as it is impossible to return to a social-democratic model of development with strong state intervention in the economy as advocated by Syriza before the elections of January 2015. This model has been disappearing for the past four decades. Rather, the solution is the overthrow and destruction of capitalism itself since its very existence creates crises, the tragic results of which we live. The solution is what we as Revolutionary Struggle have supported for years, that “the only answer to the crisis is social revolution”. The cause of the crisis is not neoliberalism as affirmed by Syriza in previous years, but capitalism itself, its very existence.

The people descended into the streets in the mobilizations of 2010 – 2012 and today on the occasion of the new memorandum, but they expected and still expect to restore the situation to pre-crisis conditions, and to maintain the gains that have been made in the past decades by the old labor and trade union movement’s compromises with capital. The protests that have been made then and now, with their defensive character, proved ineffective to halt in the slightest degree the measures taken by those governments.

But when people take to the streets in protests, it is a great opportunity for political forces to intervene catalytically by putting on the table the revolutionary perspective, the overthrow of capital and the state. And this was exactly what was missing in the period 2010 - 2012 and which is missing now. The masses taking to the streets did not hear anything other than what the regime’s trade unions and parties said to them.

The anarchist/anti-authoritarian space did not form itself into a political force that would pose the question of revolutionary perspective. It did not propose something tangibly different from the policies implemented. So it was a natural consequence that with these mass protests, however large they were, and however many riots there were in front of the Parliament, that they would eventually lose their energy and not manage to overthrow the austerity policies of the government.

I have said before in other events that the radical space found itself unprepared in front of the situation after 2010 which largely revealed its political shortcomings, its lack of analysis of our era and the political system, and its lack of perspectives, positions and proposals. To proclaim slogans like self-organization, self-management, social liberation, revolution, without being more specific is without meaning. That is why the anarchist space remains without serious popular and social support and can not intervene on the central political stage.

The answer to this impasse is to shape our own political positions and proposals, what we propose to society about the problems of our time. To have a political program, to take specific positions on the debt, memoranda, the EU and the eurozone, and what are our proposals to replace capitalism and the state. How can we shape the classless and stateless society to which we supposedly aspire, Libertarian Communism and Anarchy?

On the basis of our political objectives and positions we need to adapt accordingly our actions to achieve these goals and positions. Certainly our actions should be diverse, but to talk about revolution without preparing for armed conflict with the regime, and not to pursue armed confrontation with the regime, means that there is not really striving for revolution, and this word becomes meaningless. Social revolution is unthinkable without resorting to arms to smash the power of capital and the state.

I believe that a revolutionary movement must clearly formulate the positions and proposals of some sort of political program to allow maximum political agreement and commitment on these positions, and on the modes of action and means of struggle to implement these positions and our program. There must be as large as possible consolidation of forces, rather than a loose coordination of collectives or individuals that all have different priorities.

In the present time, we have to sabotage the implementation of the Third Memorandum and the measures taken by the government, along with the commitments they have pledged to the creditors. The range of such action is large: from the urban guerrilla, to mobilizations in the street whether violent or peaceful, counter-information and propaganda actions, or relief measures for the socially weak and vulnerable affected by the crisis, to self-organized projects, all should be pieces of one political project for subversion, not detached from each other. And an overturn cannot happen if we are not prepared for armed struggle, for armed confrontation with the central government for the capture of enemy strongholds, those places where the authorities make their decisions. If we want to make revolution we must be prepared for war literally, not figuratively, to be prepared to risk our lives. This is how I think struggles are conducted.

Also, I believe that a revolutionary movement must have a political-military character. It should have open, public action and also purely illegal action. If there was, for instance, a Federation of Anarchist Assemblies based on territorial distinctions with collectives, affinity groups and individuals participating on the basis of a clear political agreement on principles, objectives and means of struggle, this would link together and help achieve a politically revolutionary program, and parallel to this there could be an illegal armed structure, a mass armed group that would target structures of economic and political power, thus promoting the implementation of the positions and program of the Federation of Anarchist Assemblies.

This does not mean the existence of two mutually independent parts, a “legal” and an “illegal” arm of the movement, but the distinct existence of the open and public action with purely illegal and secret actions that exist within a single revolutionary movement that has diverse actions and does not have criteria for separations of legality or illegality, but is preparing for overthrow and armed confrontation with capital and the state.

There can be no revolutionary movement without having its sights set on armed struggle. There can be no serious revolutionary movement if it is not prepared for armed conflict with the regime. There can be no revolution if the movement has no armed forces and infrastructure to overwhelm the security forces and the armed forces of the regime.

Q. How to connect the solidarity with political prisoners and persecuted activists in the struggles against the memoranda, capitalist restructuring and in general the people descending on the streets at this time?

A: First of all, allow me to delineate what is solidarity. Solidarity means that we consider as comrades all who are in prison because of the means of struggle chosen and that the means chosen are integral parts of our common struggle for the revolution to overthrow capital and the state, with the one prerequisite of having a dignified attitude against the prosecuting authorities, meaning they do not cooperate with the authorities and do not repent of their actions. Solidarity means that we think and feel that with repression, persecution and imprisonment of comrades because of their action and means of struggle that they chose, this means that the state strikes at all of us. It means

the continuation of the struggle for those who are prisoners because of their revolutionary action, it means the continuation of the struggle of those who gave their lives in the struggle for the revolution to overthrow Capital and the State.

On this basis, solidarity is expressed in many ways. For example, actions that allow the political prisoners to speak, or counter-information, interventions, occupations, and demonstrations designed to publicize and popularize the words of political prisoners and the reasons why they are in prison, and most importantly, to connect all this with the general revolutionary project, namely the overthrow of capital and the state in the social struggles of our time. It can of course also be the continuation of armed struggle when it concerns prisoners who are in prison because of armed action and are members of guerrilla organizations.

To connect the solidarity with political prisoners in the struggles against the memoranda and the attack which has been unleashed by capital and the state since 2010, there should exist on the one hand (in the political space to which the political prisoners belong) the prospect of subversion and social revolution, and this certainly not at the level of wishful thinking or sloganeering, but at the level of action; and on the other hand the political prisoners themselves advance the struggle with their words or actions that have a revolutionary perspective.

For example, the words and acts of Revolutionary Struggle that are expressed either as an organization that acts, or through prison, have a wide social audience, our words can be popularized and are assimilable. Because the actions and the logic of the organization are based on the struggle against the rescue programs and policies to address the crisis, it is a call to overthrow the regime for social liberation.

We are an anarchist collective who have talked about the enormous public debt since 2005, how the Greek economy was based on a dependency policy by borrowing from the markets and the transnational economic elites, and that the country would be in a dire situation if there erupted a crisis due to debt, and we diagnosed the policies implemented by the Greek governments since 2009 to address the crisis, these policies that led to the memoranda. We diagnosed the social explosions that would be caused by these policies, which resulted in the overall discrediting and delegitimation of the system for major portions of society and this appeared in the period 2010 - 2012, and as well we diagnosed the great opportunity that occurred due to this general discrediting and delegitimation of the system for a revolutionary attempt in Greece, this opportunity that currently remains untapped. We talked on just the same grounds since 2009 of the need to create a revolutionary movement with clear objectives to attempt the overthrow of capital and the state, but this has not been possible to do so far.

We made what should in our view be the political orientations and proposals that a revolutionary movement must have today, as expressed in the creation of our platform in the notice by which we undertook the responsibility for the attack on the Bank of Greece in 2014. Of course a revolutionary movement must not forget the captives who are in state hands.

As for a practical example of how to connect the solidarity with political prisoners in the struggles against the memoranda, I could mention the proposal on my part in March 2015, when the hunger strike of the political prisoners might have had a central demonstration in Athens linking those demands of political prisoners to the fight against the Memorandum, this coming at a time when the Syriza government had signed its acceptance for the extension of the then existing Memorandum and its acceptance of debt and obligations to lenders in the meeting of the Eurogroup on February 20, 2015- but this demonstration proved impossible to undertake.

Of course, the response to the hunger strike of political prisoners then revealed that solidarity with political prisoners is not a given. I have said some things about the hunger strike of political prisoners last March- in my view, there was not an appropriate response from pieces of the anarchist/ anti-authoritarian space.

Generally over time it has been demonstrated that a large piece of the anarchist space consistently opposes and condemns armed revolutionary action but without being able to support that attitude publicly with political arguments, so instead it mobilizes on the issue of solidarity almost exclusively or more easily on issues like “violation of human rights” or in cases where the framework is of “machinations”, “persecution”, the “construction of cases”, the “criminalization of relations” , which are considered more fit for “popularization” and as more “digestible” in the eyes of society.

And because these political arguments can not be publicly supported by the depreciation of armed revolutionary action on their part, then it is most convenient in the case of prosecutions relating to armed rebel groups to misrepresent the substance of those cases, to claim that the meaning in these repressive attacks is not the suppression of armed revolutionary organizations but only the criminalization of the anarchist space, etc. In addition to the arsenal of this kind of “solidarity” has been also added the “solidarity does not mean identity”, but which has shown that the only ones who are asking for identification are only those who extend this kind of “solidarity”.

Over time, the unfortunate result of this split “solidarity” is seen with the political prisoners who are members of armed revolutionary organizations and have taken political responsibility for their organizations and actions and have carried the weight of political battles and confrontations with the state, through special courts and more generally.

The “solidarity” criteria that have prevailed in part of the anarchist space are either personal criteria, that some get mobilized on the basis whether they know someone or have personal, friendly or even family relationships; while at a political level the criterion for this split “solidarity” is the depreciation of armed revolutionary action and those who assume political responsibility for it and defend armed struggle. This is an attitude with which I disagree politically, and with which I am not in solidarity.

The hypocrisy of this split “solidarity” showed itself when I made the proposal for the creation of the Assembly of Solidarity for political prisoners, a proposal which was to determine solidarity solely on political criteria- i.e. to include all persons persecuted and imprisoned for using methods of struggle that are inextricable parts of the struggle of anarchists and revolutionaries in general, this including the communists, and with the only exception of those that have kept an undignified posture by making statements condemning actions or giving information to the authorities. In my opinion this should be the political criteria for solidarity regardless of the means of struggle of those that have been imprisoned, regardless of whether people know personally or not persecuted and imprisoned fighters, regardless of whether we agree or disagree in some or other matters, regardless whether some acknowledge their participation in armed rebel groups or whether their prosecution is a side effect of the judicial pursuit of guerrilla organizations.

But some, either inside prison or outside, raise concerns and make obstacles to create such a solidarity structure for all political prisoners because what they really wanted, but could not say so openly, was to exclude a significant portion of political prisoners as solidarity recipients since what they support - not publicly of course – is that this portion are not political prisoners. Let us not fool ourselves, let us not hide, but look at reality. Solidarity with all political prisoners as a whole who keep a dignified attitude is something that receives an underground war from parts of the radical space.

At this time, amid the general slump in social resistance (despite a mobilization period as now is the time for the pension bill of the Syriza government that implements the third Memorandum) and taking into account the general failure of the anarchist/anti-authoritarian space to emerge as it ought to, as the single serious political pole that puts on the table the revolutionary perspective, solidarity to political prisoners appears to be as discredited as ever. Any solidarity movement, any solidarity call is now settled in a fragmented manner in the general indifference, fragmentation and discord situation prevailing in the movement. Let's apply what we said previously and still holds true: whoever forgets the prisoners of war, forgets the war itself. The problem is more radical and does not concern only solidarity but the struggle overall.

In conclusion, to answer your question as to how solidarity with political prisoners relates and can relate to the struggles against the memoranda, with capitalist restructuring and people descending into the streets- this is when our action must be aimed at social revolution, when our actions must bring us together in struggle with parts of society mobilized against the memoranda in order to influence them in an anti-capitalist and anti-state direction. To do this we must have clear policy positions and objectives, a revolutionary political program, we must have clear proposals to the militant segments of society to promote the influence of an anti-capitalist and anti-state direction, so that our actions can be understood to be for the benefit and interests of those affected by the attack of capital and the state, attacked by memoranda and the austerity policies for handling the crisis. Revolutionary Struggle has such action. Our action must reach a broad social audience and not be introverted or self-referential.

To have such action that puts on the table the prospect of subversion and revolution is the best shield and protection for political prisoners and imprisoned fighters.



Whether outside or inside prison the struggle for us is a matter of honor and dignity and will continue.

The revolutionary struggle continues.

NIKOS MAZIOTIS

**Statement of Nikos Maziotis about the decision in the 2nd trial
of the Revolutionary Struggle case
March 2016**

Order has been restored. The lenders, the EU, the ECB, the IMF, the USA, the transnational economic elite, the ranks of the “institutions” can now rest easy that their puppets, the greek judges, using me as an example sentenced me to life because I blew up the building of the Bank of Greece -a branch of the European Central Bank- where the office of the representative of the IMF is also. The leftist government of Syriza, which is so sensitive in matters of “terrorism” can also rest easy because it made guarantees to the lenders that the memorandum programs can continue to be seamlessly enforced when the internal enemy is being oppressed with the “necessary strictness”.

As an anarchist, when I made the choice of armed revolutionary action, I knew the price of this choice could be a heavy conviction or even death in a clash with the police just like when it almost happened at Monastiraki in July 2014 or like when it did happen in Dafni on March 10th 2010 when the member of the Revolutionary Struggle, comrade Lambros Foundas, was killed. But the price of the struggle and my choices never scared me, not even now with the decision of the judges of the 2nd trial of the R.S. who sentenced me to life plus 129 years.

It was something that I expected as a possibility from judges that showed their intentions from the start. When the enemy shows such fury, it honors me especially because it proves how correct my choices are, the correctness of fighting opting to use weapons against a criminal regime that robs and has left hecatombs of dead people.

The life sentence for the bombing against the supervision directorate of the Bank of Greece, an act with a warning call, with no injuries but only with material damages, proves the fury of the servants of the state and the puppets of the transnational elite because we did not surrender, we did not go back to prison after our arrests in 2010 and our release because of the end of the 18 month detention period, because we chose clandestinity in order to continue the armed struggle, because we continued the action of the Revolutionary Struggle.

This decision does not intend to terrorize me –because they know they will never break me- but those who will want to choose the armed struggle, the comrades of the anarchist-antiauthoritarian milieu and the militant social groups. This decision proves the imbalance with the 1st trial of the Revolutionary Struggle where for 16 actions of the

organization me and Pola Roupá were sentenced to 50 years while in the 2nd trial for one bomb attack with a warning call and no injuries, I was sentenced to life and for the cases of the two expropriation of banks

and the armed clash with police in Monastiraki the sentence is a total of 129 years.

The fury of the judges of the 2nd trial becomes more obvious considering it convicted me arbitrarily with the charge of “managing”, something that was rejected in the first trial. This decision will not scare me in any way. I am a lifelong militant of the struggle for Revolution, the subversion of Capital and the State. I willingly give my life for this struggle.

Comrades do not fear them and counter-attack.
The struggle continues until the last breath.

LONG LIVE THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE



On 16/07/14 in the heart center of Athens anarchist fighter Nikos Maziotis was arrested after a armed clash with anti terrorist forces cops during which he was injured.

Solidarity is one of our many weapons against State totalitarianism and social indifference.
Our glass is spilling over with tears for the convictions and murders of our comrades,
bullets in their bodies,
the brutal repression of the anarchist movement,
and the apathy of the masses.
The passion for freedom is stronger than all cells,
and will be forever as long as they persecute us.
Practical solidarity with anarchist revolutionary Nikos Maziotis.
Multiform Revolutionary Struggle,
to the end.
Comrades in solidarity

March 3rd 2016 In the end the judges and prosecutor in the 2nd trial of the R.S. implemented the orders they received from the anti-terrorist force with excess zeal.

Nikos Maziotis was sentenced to life plus 129 years as well as a 20.000 euro fine.

Pola Roupa was sentenced to 11 years for various misdemeanors (she will tried for the felonies when and if she is caught).

Adonis Staboulos was sentenced to 13 years.

Giorgos Petrakakos was sentenced to 36 years as well as 9.000 euro fine.

In the early morning hours of January 5th 2017, two Revolutionary Struggle members, fugitive comrade Pola Roupa and anarchist Konstantina Athanasopoulou were captured at a southern area of Athens. Anti-terrorist cops raided a hideout with Pola and her six-year-old son inside, while Konstantina was arrested in another house nearby.

After being forcibly removed from his mother, Lambros-Viktoras Maziotis Roupas—the small son of Revolutionary Struggle members Nikos Maziotis and Pola Roupa—is being held captive inside a children's hospital in Athens guarded by cops...

In response to this, three Revolutionary Struggle members—Nikos Maziotis, the recaptured comrade Pola Roupa and the newly arrested Konstantina Athanasopoulou—have undergone hunger and thirst strike since January 5th, demanding that the six-year-old be immediately placed with his aunt and grandmother.

Konstantina's statement:

"I am an anarchist, member of the armed revolutionary organization Revolutionary Struggle. The only terrorists are the State and the Capital. I refuse to eat and drink anything until the child of my comrades Pola Roupa and Nikos Maziotis is delivered to relatives of theirs.

Konstantina Athanasopoulou"



REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

*A collection of letters, texts and
communications from an armed
group in Greece and
their accused...*

ARMED STRUGGLE: A
SOCIAL REVOLUTION

